

Text used: Loeb Classical Library. Translated by Harold North Fowler.

There are a few chairs probably available in the departmental ante-chambre, so if someone is there...You know where the departmental office is? There are some chairs around and you might try to pick them up. Which number is it, 309? No, 307. 306.

Well, the first thing I want to do in my own name and by anticipation in the name of the class, to express my happiness to see Mr. Reinken back. Mr. Reinken has been serving as a reader in my courses for many years now, and no one could have done it better. Good.

Now let us turn to our subject. This is an introduction to political philosophy, which will be given in the form of a discussion of Plato's Apology of Socrates and his Crito. I assume but do not presuppose that you have read these writings, because they are very popular and are accessible in many inexpensive editions. But it is not presupposed; I only ask you to read the two books, short works, carefully, while we go. The Apology of Socrates is Socrates' formal defense before an Athenian law court. He had been accused of not believing in the gods in which the city believes, and in corrupting the young. Socrates claims of course to be wholly innocent. Yet he was found guilty and condemned to death. In the Crito Socrates is presented as waiting in prison for his execution, and there he was given the opportunity to escape. Yet he refused to avail himself of this opportunity, despite of the fact that he was unjustly condemned. His reason was, one must obey the laws, even if one is legally, although unjustly, condemned to die. The bare statement of these most obvious facts suffices to arouse in us indignation, indignation about the Athenians who murdered their best citizen, and also indignation about Socrates, who demands that one should obey every law, every judicial decision, who condemns in advance everyone who ever tried to escape from a Nazi or Communist execution chamber—because in quite a few cases these people were legally condemned. Now these acts of indignation are quite healthy, and I urge you to indulge them, for I would like us to have a perfectly uninhibited discussion of the issues involved. I ask you only for one kind of restraint—propriety of speech. And by this I mean not merely that you should not use dirty words, but I mean that you...I'll give you a better example. Do not call Socrates' fate a tragedy. For the murder of a man, or any other human being, is terrible, but not tragic in any serious sense. For there is, according to the master of those who know, there is no tragedy without mistake, without guilt of the sufferer. Now if some innocent human being is murdered there is no guilt or mistake involved. Not destruction but self destruction, or rather self destruction of a certain kind is tragic. So I give this as an example of propriety of speech, not to use the word tragic with the usual levity. One of the greatest men who applied his mind to Socrates' fate did describe it as tragic, and that man was Hegel. But he made an assumption which is not self evident, not self evident, namely, that Socrates was guilty as charged, and therefore deserved his death. Yet his death was tragic, and not like the end of a common criminal, because a higher right was on Socrates' side. The right with which Socrates came into conflict was the divine right based on immemorial tradition, the actual, inherited, moral religious order, which lays claim to man's conscience as a matter of course, without advancing sufficient

reasons. This divine right is based...in this sense is based on the premise, ultimately, if we cut away all frills, that the good is identical with the ancestral. Socrates, according to Hegel, rightly questioned that primal equation. The human mind legitimately desires to act on insight, and that means to act freely. The human mind desires to do the right knowing that it is right, and not merely because it is told that it is right. And as a consequence of this, Socrates raised the questions which the old Athenians had never raised, as to whether the gods are and what they are. Yet this freedom, that I call, as it were, before the tribunal of my reason, everything which lays claims on me, is what Hegel calls the conscience, and I believe many of us call it this way. This freedom lacks by itself content. It is an empty freedom, although a very profound freedom. Hence Socrates questioned the traditional order. He subverted it, and yet was unable to put another order, at the order of reason, in its place. And to that extent Socrates was guilty. He subverted, he destroyed, without building up.

Now a sign of this inadequacy of Socrates is found by Hegel in Socrates' recourse to his daimonion. Now, Mr. Reinken, will you write this on the blackboard? If you have any trouble with the , let me know. Well, this daimonion-- I will always use the Greek word because there is no proper English translation. The nearest literal translation would be a demonic thing. The thing which Socrates claimed to possess in himself and which gave him some guidance. This daimonion, of which we will hear quite a bit in the Republic [Apology?] was a kind of private oracle, not like the famous public oracles of Delphi and other places, for it had its seat within the free individual. But it nevertheless lacked rationality. If Socrates says, "I don't do that because the daimonion advises me against it," then he doesn't have a good reason, except that this voice, popping up as it were, speaks against it. Socrates' fate was then necessary. He was guilty as charged. He questioned the religious basis of the Athenian state, and he corrupted the young by undermining paternal authority. Paternal authority, of course, because the fathers are older, good equal to ancestral, that goes then through your forefathers, grandfather, father more immediately, and by questioning it one questions paternal authority. On the other hand Socrates was right in saying that the Athenian state lacked a proper basis. But since he could not supply another social order, then Athenians were right in condemning him. And so this fact that Socrates was guilty in a very important sense, this makes his fate tragic.

Yet the Athenians repented of their verdict a few years after Socrates' execution. They thus admitted that they, their state, had already been affected or infected by the Socratic principle. In other words, if anyone had the right to condemn Socrates it were not the Athenians, because they suffered from the same defect. And this principle is the principle of free examination by the individual. Now this much about Hegel's view.

According to a more popular view, right was entirely on Socrates' side. The state has no business to prescribe its citizens what they should believe or not believe. Socrates is the classic martyr for the freedom of questioning, the freedom of the quest for the truth, the freedom of thought. If Socrates acted against the law of Athens, as he probably did, he acted against an unjust law, and therefore he acted justly. But, very well, but why then does he demand, as he apparently does in the Crito, that one must obey the law of the land without any qualifications, any ifs and buts? Besides, was not Athens the citadel of freedom, and in particular of intellectual freedom? Many of you have read or heard of Pericles'

funeral speech in Thucydides, where Athens is presented as such a citadel of freedom. But here we see...The only passage where Pericles explicitly speaks of philosophy, he says "We," namely, "We Athenians, philosophize without softness." "Without softness." And this might very well be taken to imply that philosophizing with softness was strictly forbidden. And since it is very hard to draw a line between philosophy with or without softness, this explains that Athens was not the citadel of freedom in the sense in which this country with its very great freedom of speech can be called a citadel of freedom. Incidentally this information we receive from the funeral speech is confirmed by Plato's dialogue Gorgias, where a most impressive character called Callicles blames those who philosophize when they are already mature men. In other words, as long as they are lads, that's fine, but if a mature, grown up man still does this, sitting in corners and talking instead of doing a man's work, this is like...as ridiculous and disgusting as a grown up man using baby talk, or lisping, as [these examples?]. Now these observations show incidentally that the theme of the Apology of Socrates and of the Crito must be of utmost interest to everyone seriously concerned with political matters. For even if it is true that modern liberal democracy has solved the problem which Socrates according to Hegel did not solve, namely, the establishment of a moral social order which is rational and therefore binding on reason, and not like the old divine right which was not rational and therefore unconvincing, for even if it were true that modern liberal democracy has solved the problem which Socrates according to Hegel did not solve, it is also true, according to the same Hegel, that the modern solution presupposes...presupposed the full elaboration in the course of history of the conflict between Socrates and the city of Athens. Simply stated, our solution, whatever we might have to think of it, would never have been reached unless there had been that tragic conflict between Socrates and the city of Athens, and the infinite consequences of this conflict--the work of Plato in the first place, of Aristotle in the second place, and all of the other philosophers who then...and whose difficulties, and so on, led finally men toward another type of solution, of which liberal democracy is now best known to us.

Now the question concerning the conflict between Socrates and the city of Athens is in itself what we call a historical question, and therefore, being a historical question, the question becomes in the first place one of our sources. How do we know, and how well do we know of this conflict? Is Plato's Apology of Socrates, in particular, a source? It presents itself as the speech of defense delivered by Socrates himself. And hence we can say it is a source of the first order, since it presents the issue between Socrates and the city of Athens from one of the two sides. We unfortunately do not have the speeches of the accusers. If we had both we would know everything we wish to know about that conflict. But is the Apology of Socrates, as we shall read it, the speech of defense delivered by Socrates himself? No one believes this. In other words, no one believes that Plato had a kind of tape recorder or stenographer and put it down and so we read it exactly as Socrates delivered it. Everyone believes that the Apology of Socrates is a work of Plato. Yet nevertheless it presents itself as Socrates' own speech. Now if we are...want to make the situation quite clear and at the same time use proper speech, we must say the Apology of Socrates raises a false claim. It is, to speak properly, a lie. I mean the Greek word pseudos, which I translate by lie, means every falsehood, and does not have all the unpleasant connotation which our word lie has. Nevertheless, Plato presents Socrates as making this

speech, and the innocent reader believes he hears what Socrates said in 399 in Athens. He misleads him; he doesn't get the real McCoy. He gets something which Plato made, perhaps on the basis of genuine materials, but as it is it is not the genuine thing.

Now this is particularly noteworthy since within the Apology Socrates repeatedly insists on his saying the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Now this leads us to this interesting question: Can a man's utter veracity be the theme of a non-veracious speech? Because the Apology of Socrates is not a veracious speech because it is as we have it a work of Plato, not of Socrates. We moderns, present day people, have an easy way out. We say the Apology is a work of art, a poetic work. And therefore you can't apply such a crude word like lie. But we have to wonder at this stage, our notion of art may be very sound and may be wonderful, but is it the Platonic view of art, the Platonic view of poetry? What did Plato think about poetry? Well, you probably have heard or have read that Plato expelled the poets from his best city, ultimately because of their untruthfulness. And therefore Plato would never see this excuse which comes so natural to us. Plato's writing the Apology cannot be separated entirely from his writing the Crito, and many other Socratic dialogues. Plato always makes Socrates speak. Again it is perfectly proper for us in an uninhibited discussion to compare him with a--how do you call him?--a ventriloquist, a ventriloquist. Plato makes Socrates speak. All these speeches are Plato's speeches, Plato's writings. Socrates never wrote books or speeches. Yet in a letter that has come down to us as Platonic, we read, "There is not now nor will there be any writing of Plato. But those writings which are now said to be his belong to Socrates, having become fair (noble) and young (new)." The alternative translations are equally possible. Conclusion: The Apology is the work not of Plato, nor of Socrates according to the flesh, but of Socrates having become noble, fair, and young. The speech of Socrates who has become transfigured, idealized. And we may draw this conclusion, that in this dimension one cannot make a distinction between Socrates and Plato, and one cannot be seriously concerned with that. The question of the sources, in other words, must be abandoned as unanswerable. So we drop the historical question.

But without a question one cannot enter, penetrate a book. The question need not be explicit, but it is better if it is explicit, at least in the case of an older man. Now the alternative to a historical question is the philosophic question, or at any rate a philosophic question. Which is that philosophic question? We can say without going out of bounds, that question is the relation of the philosopher, classically presented by Socrates, to the city, classically presented by Athens. But the city--what is a city? Not the houses and walls. The city is above all the citizens. But is the philosopher, too, not also a citizen? At least he may be one, and Socrates was a citizen. So we have to say, not the relation of the philosopher to the city, but the relation of the philosopher to the non-philosophers. This is indeed the question without which no Platonic work will open itself to us. One can understand quite a few things without it, but one will miss something very important.

Now this question of the relation of the philosopher to the non-philosophers is of utmost importance if, as Socrates or Plato assert, the way of life of the philosopher is the right way of life. Because then we have to raise the question,

what is the relation of those who lead the right way of life to those who do not? Is the relation one of conflict, the good versus the bad? Or can there be a harmony between the two kinds of men? Or, another possibility, that one kind is entirely absorbed by the other. Either the philosophers disappear or the non-philosophers disappear, the non-philosophers becoming philosophers. There is another alternative suggested to us by the Republic. No conflict and no absorption, but rule of the philosophers over the non-philosophers. This seems to be a very far-fetched suggestion. And if one takes it very literally I believe it is a very far-fetched suggestion. But nevertheless it is very important to consider it. We have an equivalent to this question nearer home and more down to earth. In democracy where the question arises, who should have the last say--the democratic assemblies or the experts? This is a very serious question. I think former President Eisenhower spoke of it very strongly in his latest speeches. Now this is the great question: Can one clarify this issue--democracy or rule of experts--without understanding experts in the light of philosophers? For the following reason: Experts are, as everybody knows, specialists, which means partial knowers. Now the partial, the incomplete, cannot be properly understood except in the light of the complete. And the complete knower, at least according to their claim...to his claim, is the philosopher. So I think we will not completely disregard our immediate political problems by considering such a seemingly far-fetched issue.

I have said that given the particular difficulties regarding the Apology...I speak now of the Apology, although I think it is not quite proper to do so, because the title is Apology of Socrates, and it is important. There is no Platonic dialogue in which the name of Socrates occurs except the Apology of Socrates. And since Plato did this with some reason, I think we owe it to him, and therefore also to ourselves, that we should call it by its proper name, the Apology of Socrates. But in a class, as distinguished from publication, pedantism should not rule, have full rule, which I gladly admit. So given the particular difficulties regarding the Republic / Apology? / we have no choice but to turn from the historical question to a philosophical question, to a question belonging to political philosophy. Now some difficulties are involved in this going over from history to philosophy. The most obvious, why do we study the Apology, i.e., engage in what at any rate seems to be a historical study? Furthermore, in making this transition we presuppose that political philosophy is possible. Now this is in a way the graver objection. With what right do we make this assumption? In order to understand this issue, or to begin to understand it, one must remind oneself of the simple reasoning which originally brought forth, we can say, political philosophy. I have stated this very frequently, and since I see some old acquaintances here, I ask them for indulgence, but, as a Greek proverb says, twice and thrice the nice things. So I will not hesitate.

Starting quite from the obvious, what every child can see, politics is a kind of action. Now every action, every political action, has to do either with preservation or with change. We try to preserve what is good; we try to change what is no good. So all action is based on some awareness of good and bad. This awareness by itself has the character of opinion. We cannot very easily, at least, give reasons why we regard this as good and this as bad. But whenever we have an opinion and are aware of the fact that it is only an opinion, this very fact points us to knowledge, at least to quest for knowledge. So we must seek for knowledge of the good and of the bad, in the political sense of the term. The

comprehensive political good with which all action...to which all political action is referred, directly or indirectly, is the complete political good, the good society, a term which you doubtless know. It has...is not used any more with the frequency with which it was used in former times, but this is a kind of shame-facedness which is incompatible with that propriety of speech to which I referred before. For example, people speak of the open society and not of the good society, but when you read them you see that they mean by the open society the good society. And at present, under the present Administration, we hear much of the Great Society. But one has to know very little of American usage to know that great is only one way of saying good, for example, it's a great day means of course a good day and not a day of disaster. So it is hard to avoid, it is impossible to avoid some notion of the good society, implying it, and it is important at least for thinking people to make explicit what one does not ordinarily make explicit.

Now this reasoning is perfectly evident, and everyone can check it by simply repeating the thought which I sketched. Yet despite this prima facie evidence of the conception of political philosophy, the majority of contemporary political science professors denies the possibility of political philosophy. And they say-- I mean they are not always very articulate in this matter. Well they are in one way very definite in their assertions, but not very articulate at the same time. But if one tries to state it in simple, proper language, they say political philosophy is impossible. Only political science is possible. Of course they use also, since they are not very good at proper speech, they use also the word philosophy all the time without questioning. For example they might speak of Orlando Wilson's philosophy of big city police administration; you must have heard that. [Laughter] Now this is of course a very loose use of the word, and we will...But I think I have to mention it. Now it is almost wholly needless to study the Apology of Socrates and the Crito, and other things of this kind, if we do not possess a previous grasp of the almost overpowering resistance to the fundamental premise of the Apology, and so on. And this premise is the possibility of political philosophy. In speaking of that resistance I shall not tell you anything new, far-fetched; I only remind you of things which you have, if I may use this term, sucked together--not altogether with your mothers' milk--but, if I may say so, with your high school teachers' milk. So forgive me if I become somewhat trivial. What I am trying to do, in other words, is this: You have read frequently that there is a climate of opinion, an atmosphere, and there are many other terms of this nature, you know? In which...of which we are as little aware as we are ordinarily aware of the air, without which we could not possibly breathe and live. Now and I think it is a very important task for thinking people to make explicit, to make conscious, that which we tacitly presuppose all the time. I believe that is not the function of cultural anthropology and other sciences but of a much more humble and practical thing.

Now let me begin to try to make this clear, because the atmosphere which surrounds us, in which we live, is not a matter of today or yesterday. This has a long prehistory, and we must have some rough understanding of that history if we want to have a proper understanding of that very atmosphere. Now I begin at the beginning again. Political philosophy, I said, is the quest for the good society. Of course the society good for man, meaning, in accordance with the requirements of man's nature. There are certain things which man needs by nature in order to be truly man, truly a human being. And this implies that man has by nature certain

ends. Well you see it immediately in the case of the elementary needs like food, and so on, but it applies also perhaps to other things. In this respect there is no difference between man and the other animals. But man's end, the end natural to man, are peculiar to him. Let us take the example of medicine, concerned with health. And it is here understood that health is good, and a good which is a natural good, meaning good not by virtue of a fashion or of any human agreement, propaganda, and the like, but a good which our nature if unimpeded desires. There is also, and that is of course a more interesting one, a health of the soul, of which we speak analogously to the health of the body, not merely in the sense in which psychiatry presupposes this but in a larger sense. For example a perfectly well adjusted promoter of legal merchandise does not necessarily possess a healthy soul in the stricter sense, although he may be perfectly...he may not need any psychiatric treatment, because he functions so well. Health of the soul, that was understood as possessing and practicing the virtues. Now virtues--one could also sweeten that bitter word by saying excellences, but I don't see why one should sweeten it. I don't think that virtue is a word which one must avoid at all cost. But I will illustrate only by enumerating some of the virtues of which people talk: courage, moderation, justice, magnanimity, gentleness, thoughtfulness, and so on. The virtues and their practice are the natural ends of the human soul, and they are the and per excellence of man. Since a political community is a community of man, the highest task of the political community is then the concern with the virtue of its members. Not every political community is able or willing to be so concerned, and therefore there are a variety of kinds of political communities, what was called regimes. There are regimes dedicated to other ends, say, to the acquisition of wealth and to the enjoyment of wealth and to virtue only to the extent to which it is necessary to have some decency against fraud and forging of checks, and so on. This is also possible. But since there is a variety of such regimes, these...they determine the character, the intention, the overriding concern of a society, they are the primary subject of political science in the older sense of the term. We know this today; that we understand immediately. For example, today we look at the political map, we see the conflict between liberal democracy and communism and the various things in between, which can easily be figured out on the basis of these two extremes, and then we...So in other words this task of political science is perhaps not sufficiently alive within the profession but can be made clear immediately on the basis of what we all politically know and are above all concerned with. This variety of the regimes by itself, which existed at all times, is...gives, we can say, the first impulse toward the guiding question of political philosophy, namely, the question of the best regime. Because strange as it may sound, every regime that ever was, is, and will be claims explicitly or implicitly that it is the best regime. Well I'm perfectly willing to argue that out if you have any doubt about that. Now I merely assert it. And for some strange reason, loyalty to a regime, full dedication to it, induces most men to say that regime is the finest thing that ever was, and therefore our full loyalty, our full dedication, is properly given to it. Good.

Now this, what I said up to now, was a very rough sketch of political philosophy as understood by Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and quite a few--in fact, very many--other philosophers, both in antiquity and in the Middle Ages. For convenience's sake I call that classical political philosophy. Now the crucial presupposition of classical political philosophy was, as you might have observed, that there are natural ends of man which have a natural order. In other words, there is

not a chase of ends, but there is a hierarchy of ends. Because if there were a variety of ends with no order, then we would be of course confused all the time; there wouldn't be natural ends in any reasonable sense. Now this notion that there are natural ends of man went together with the notion that there are natural ends in nature generally speaking. So to that extent classical political philosophy is based on a certain kind of natural science. Since the word natural science has taken on such a specific meaning in our modern times, I will use an older term. I will speak of physiologia--please [to Reinken]--which means the speech, the discussion, of physis, of nature. Now this was done, elaborated, by the classical philosophers. And there were certain difficulties, because--as is shown by the fact that Plato and Aristotle, in particular, did not entirely agree as to that physiologia, and above all, and in a way most interesting of all, there were philosophers in classical antiquity who developed a physiologia which was not teleological, which denied that there are natural ends. And the most famous representatives of this view are Democritus and Epicurus. I mention these names advisedly--Democritus and Epicurus. Democritus prior to Plato, Epicurus after.

Now let us consider for one moment the effect which this grave question--teleological or non-teleological physiologia--has on political philosophy. In the Epicurean tradition there is no political philosophy, i.e., there is no quest for the best regime. It is in this strict sense un-political. They are students of nature, seeking their happiness, each privately or in small groups of friends, but no serious concern for the polis. Now the reason for this is not that the Epicureans denied natural ends of all men. In a way they denied it strictly speaking, but in another sense they did not deny it, for they made this assertion, that the good is identical with the pleasant. And the pleasant is of course then a natural end. Now and the first step leading from that is that we have to choose the more pleasant rather than the more painful, and so on; a calculation of pleasures and pains, a felicific calculus as it was called by Bentham much later. But it culminated, the Epicurean doctrine, in the view that there is a maximum pleasure, a highest pleasure, which is indeed obtainable only through philosophy. Which has nothing to do with the polis, with the city, except in a very secondary way, but philosophy is its condition. Now why then was there no political philosophy, strictly speaking, although there was something like a teleology in Epicurean thought? And we can state it very simply: Political philosophy, pre-modern, classical political philosophy, is based on the fundamental premise that the moral, as we would say, is fundamentally different from the pleasant. And now let me re-translate that into Greek. To kalon, the noble or fine, is something fundamentally different from the pleasant. Virtue is choiceworthy for its own sake because of its intrinsic nobility. It is not to be chosen because it is productive of pleasure as the Epicureans said. Now this much, or this little, about classical political philosophy.

I must now explain very briefly, very summarily, very cursorily, the peculiarity of modern political philosophy which created that climate, that atmosphere, of which I spoke. Modern political philosophy emerged through a clear break with classical political philosophy, through a deep sense of dissatisfaction. The first great event was Machiavelli. And in Machiavelli the clearest and most accessible statement is in his Prince, chapter 15. One can restate what Machiavelli says there as follows: The classics, Plato and Aristotle above all, had said that the best regime, the regime dedicated to virtue, is possible. Otherwise

only a fool would strive for it. But not necessarily ever actual. It is an object of wish or prayer, of the wish or prayer of reasonable men of course. But although it is likely never to be actual it is indispensable as a standard for judging properly of the various imperfect societies in which men live. How could we diagnose this imperfection if we did not have a standard of perfection? Now Machiavelli's point is this: According to Plato and Aristotle the best regime is said to be according to nature, according to the requirements of human nature. But can it be according to nature if it never, or hardly ever exists? Must there not be a natural obstacle to it which prevents it from coming into being most of the time? The ground of the error of the classics, according to Machiavelli, is this: They took their bearings by virtue, by how men should live, or how they ought to live. And this leads to the result that we get a wholly useless--as later men would say, a wholly utopian--fantastic political philosophy. The only sane thing to do is to change one's orientation radically, and to take one's bearings by how men do live, down to earth. We may loosely call this realism. Machiavelli opposes this realism to the idealism of Plato, Aristotle, and so on. Machiavelli calls these best regimes the imaginary kingdoms or principalities, and by this he means not merely Plato and Aristotle but also the Biblical tradition. The Kingdom of God would be from his point of view, although he doesn't say so, an imaginary kingdom. Now this simple step, which I believe every one of you has...is familiar with, became effective on a large scale only by the intervention of some great successors of Machiavelli, men who have not the bad reputation which Machiavelli in a way still has. In other words they were more sober, more cautious. But nevertheless they built on Machiavelli's foundation. Now in this further elaboration, use was made of a concept which I have not yet had occasion to mention, the concept of a natural law in the sense of a normative law. This notion that there is a natural law as a normative law is one possible interpretation of classical political philosophy. It is not Plato, not Aristotle, but to some extent the Stoics, and above all, the Scholastics. To simplify matters, according to the Thomist doctrine of natural law, which is the most renowned, natural law consists as it were of three parts corresponding to three kinds of natural inclinations of men. Inclination means here always inclination toward an end, not in the sense in which the word is now used. And these three inclinations are self preservation, preservation of the species, and therefore also of political society, and knowledge. And of course knowledge and in the second place, society, are higher in rank than self preservation, and therefore the whole importance of virtue is implied in the fact that knowledge and society are higher than the individual in his self preservation. Now what was done as a consequence of Machiavelli--in the first place by Hobbes--was to say this: We do need a natural law. That's for Hobbes a matter of course, as it is for Locke after him. But not these higher stories. The lowest is the only thing which we need--the lowest, the desire for self preservation. The lowest, and therefore the most dependable. And if we build the whole edifice of natural law on the most defensible basis then it will be much more valuable, much more solid, than the traditional doctrine, which regarded it only, as it were, as an introduction to the higher. The practical consequence is--which is not in this form drawn by Hobbes but only by Locke--that the political society or the state has as such no concern whatever with virtue and vice. It is concerned with peace, with law and order, but virtue and vice is none of its business. And of course this leads to very great questions up to the present day. For example, you know the Berkeley demonstrations, where freedom of speech and obscenity of speech was especially demanded, is the prohibition against obscenity not a concern with virtue

and a concern with virtue is not a political concern. In a way—it is a complicated thing—in a way this new kind of natural right, the classics of which are Hobbes and Locke, this new doctrine is hedonistic and in this respect akin to the Epicureans. But there is one radical difference between these modern hedonists and the Epicureans and any other earlier hedonists. Hobbes and Locke deny that there is a highest good, what the Epicureans had asserted. There is no summum bonum. And connected with this in a way which I cannot now show is the fact that the old hedonism was radically un-political, whereas the new hedonism is radically political. Generally speaking in pre-modern times you had, say, an idealistic tradition, which is political, and a hedonistic tradition, which was non-political. Now in the 17th century a merger of these two traditions takes place, a political hedonism. And that is one of the greatest changes which has ever happened, and of course up to the present day this determines [us?], with many modifications which would lead us too far.

Now the full development of these things which I have only here sketched presupposed a break with pre-modern physiologia, and this is the side of it which is best known because it is most obvious. This break with pre-modern physiologia took place after Machiavelli, generations after Machiavelli. And we have here the strange thing that the first great break still took place under the presupposition of the old kind of physiologia, be it Aristotelian or any other. But then we have this great change which...we all think in the first place of Galileo. Now let us turn to this break with pre-modern physiologia. And again I limit myself to the most simple and superficial side of the matter. What strikes, would strike everyone concerned with knowledge of nature, would be the fact that there was such a variety of doctrines. Platonic doctrine of nature is not Aristotelian; and that is not Stoic, and that is not Epicurean, and so others. A disgraceful variety; a chaos. And this leads in itself, and had led already in antiquity, to skepticism. If a pursuit is feasible then there will be agreement. The mere fact of disagreement shows that this is impossible. But there was one beacon for some men who were concerned with physiologia, and that was that there existed a science which in spite of all skepticism functioned where there was no division into schools, and that was of course mathematics. So what these men then were striving after was a new kind of physiologia which would be, if I may say so, as metaphysically neutral as mathematics. That had never existed before. Mathematics is an old story, but there was no Platonic mathematics, Aristotelian mathematics, Epicurean mathematics. Different degrees to which they were interested in mathematics—that's another matter. But now the attempt was made, taking mathematics as a model, to produce such a physiologia where all men, all competent men, would agree, just as they agreed in mathematics. Now the result was modern physics, which is as non-teleological as Epicurean physics, but is distinguished from Epicurean physics by its mathematical character, which if we want to see the source is rather to be found in Plato than in any of the other great Greek men. But here again we must not make the mistake of superficial people, and say, "Well, here you have a combination of Epicureanism with Platonism," as if this were not precisely the problem—how can you bring water and fire together? I mean in most cases these eclectic compromises are just despicable, a proper object of compassion, because people are in trouble and try to make the best of it. But these combinations which are of utmost importance are those that come about by the thinker in question putting the question on a novel basis, where the whole issue looks different than it did before. And this discovery of the new basis, this creative

act, is the important thing, much more important than what he took from source A and what he took from source B. I said a combination of Epicurean *physica* with mathematics. Yet this mathematical character, as it were, increased the non-teleological character of modern physics. That is in itself a rather enigmatic statement; in order to understand it one would have to read the second book of Aristotle's *Physica*, where he speaks of the relation between mathematical and teleological necessities.

However this may be, the final result of this development--taking together both the new physics and what came out from Machiavelli and his succession--there is no natural standard whatever. The standard can come...There is no natural standard whatever. Whereas all these older schools, with the exception of Skeptics, had said...the Skeptics denied any standard...had said there is a natural standard. But we need a standard. Where can we get it? And the answer, the classic modern answer given long after Hobbes and Locke had done their work was given by Kant. The standard comes from reason as distinguished from nature. Now I will show briefly how this is connected with modern natural right, based on self preservation alone. Now if the fundamental instinct, urge, or however we may call it [provisionally?], of man is self preservation and nothing else, then man is not by nature a social being. He becomes social because he finds out he cannot preserve himself well without living in an organized society. But by nature he is not social. Yet he still remains, for Hobbes and Locke, the rational animal. And that is perhaps the simplest formula one can give for this kind of philosophy. The rationality of man is maintained; his sociality, his natural sociality, is denied. Now and that implies, of course, that since man is not by nature social, that man strictly speaking precedes society, a thought which appeared--in this case one must say happily--but still we must understand it because in indirect ways this notion still . . . All modern individualism is originally based on this view that man precedes society. And these isolated men without any social bonds come together in order freely to establish society. And the state in which man is before he enters society came then to be called the state of nature--not the ancient term. Man's natural right is the right which man has in the state of nature, i.e., in the pre-social state. But if you look...This was very clear in Hobbes. But then if you look a bit more closely in the state of nature and at these premises, and that was done not before Rousseau, the state of nature eventually proved then to be a sub-human state, the state of a stupid animal, not a state of man. Now if in the state of nature we find man as a stupid animal, and not yet man, how can the state of nature supply standards for a human life? So one has to abandon the orientation by nature; reason takes its place. And that was done decisively by Kant. Reason divorced from the tutelage of nature, as Kant called it.

Now the practical importance of this step was immense, as you see from the following consideration. In former times, prior to Kant, it was always possible to argue against people who had...were very sanguine regarding what you could do with human society, "Well, human nature puts a limit to that. You know, there is something in man which will prevent a society without any flaws." Now but if human nature is in no way to be considered in the establishment of the ideal, if only reason is considered, the situation becomes very different. The implication of what Kant says is that man is of infinite malleability. So there is no human nature to speak of, so that we cannot know how far progress, especially social progress, may go. This has of course had a tremendous effect up to the present

day. People who would be horrified by the thought that they owe anything to Kant do owe this crucial point

Now reason as Kant understood it, which fulfills this function, must be pure reason, because if it is not pure reason, if it is based on experience, then man hitherto slips in and becomes the standard. So if we want to have, say, a perfectly just society, we must base it on pure reason alone. Man is the rational animal. That is still the same. But how does it come that men never knew these true standards except now? Take the simple, trite example of Aristotle, who was as bright and as philanthropic as Kant, and yet thought that slavery is not against nature, not against right, whereas Kant and Locke of course deny that. How come that the true rational standards have become known only now, meaning late 18th century? The answer: Reason discovers the true standards only in a long process of emancipation from the natural bonds, a long process of enlightenment. The true standards become known only as a result of an extensive historical process. The true standards have now become known, say, in 1800, because the historical process is in the decisive respect completed. Because if we know the true standards with perfect lucidity, then of course there is an infinite task to put them into practice--that may take centuries if not millennia. But as far as the human mind itself is concerned, we know the maximum we can possibly wish to know. We are sitting on the peak of the world. The individual is the son of his age, as was said shortly after Kant, only if he is the son of the age of reason. The Age of Reason is a well known book by Tom Paine. Only if he is the son of the age of reason can he know the rational order of society; but then he will know it, unless he is terribly lazy, or wicked. I will skip a long story--I must skip it--and I will only say this, what happened--the next great step which affects us. Many of the things effected today you will have recognised by these ancient stories. But the very great step which was taken in the course of the 19th century, after man like Kant and Hegel had done their work, was this: Is the historical process ever completed? Is the knowledge of the standards ever perfectly rational? And if not, what happens? If we are always in the midst of the historical current, stream, if we are all the sons of our age, we are bound by the limitations of our age, and that means of course that we are as much under the spell of prejudices as our benighted ancestors. And this will be so as long as there will be human beings. And the notion that this means, however, less and less prejudice--you know? more benighted or less benighted, and so on and so on--but how do we know that this notion of progress is not an idea belonging to a particular age, which has its time and will finally have the fate of all such ideas? This is the end of this. Now this position, this view which is very powerful today I call--and not only I--historicism, meaning that all human thought depends ultimately on principles which essentially belong to an age and which cannot be criticised with reference to a higher standard.

We may have to come back to that on proper occasion, but historicism affects social science in general, and political science in particular, but is not the most powerful ingredient of social science. That most powerful ingredient is what I call positivism. Positivism is the view according to which there is only one way to knowledge, and that is science in the sense in which science is understood now. So that's a long story. Positivism disposes of political philosophy in a very simple, and one can even say elegant, way. All science has to do with facts, relations of facts, correlations, functions, what have you. But facts are something radically different from values. Regarding values no knowledge whatever is pos-

sible, except of course the knowledge that Mr. A cherishes value Alpha. But this is not knowledge of values; it's not knowledge that value Alpha deserves to be cherished. This is the version, I take it, with which you have been all imbued from a very early age, and so I do not have to labor this point. Now despite of the almost overwhelming power of positivism, and historicism, in our age, the simple reasoning leading up to political philosophy--a reasoning which I sketched--has not lost its primary evidence. And therefore we see time and again people, also young people, rebel more or less strongly against this value-free or valueless conception of social science. But this primary evidence doubtless needs now some external support against this terrific steamroller, which threatens to bury everything else. And that, I think, is the reason why it is good to study Plato--in order to clarify and to strengthen the primary evidence in favor of the concern with the good society.

Now I mention finally another point. We shall study, if all goes well, the Apology and the Crito. And we shall proceed roughly in this way: Mr. Reinken will be so good to read a fairly short passage in the English translation, and then I will comment on it. And so we will go over the whole ground. In other words we will read the two books with greater care than it is ordinarily done. I'm not speaking now of what classical scholars do, but classical scholars do not have the obligation to face historicism and positivism which a member of a political science department faces. In other words we will all undergo, for the first time, or continue, a training in how to read worthwhile books. And here I appeal also to a very common experience. You know that today the trend is toward reading very much and very fast. I have seen syllabi of courses, single courses, which...I mean no student can comply with them unless he reads very much, and that means of course given the finiteness of man, very fast. And there must be some place or places in which this trend is counter-acted by an attempt to read a little and slowly. I do not know how long it will take us. I suppose we will not have much time, if any, after we are through with these two dialogues; but if we have some time left, which is possible, then I would give a short discussion of Xenophon's treatment of the discussion of Socrates, because that would be of some interest. A contemporary, and a great contemporary of Plato, who presents the issue apparently in a very different way, and this might be helpful. But I cannot promise anything. Now if Mr. Reinken's watch is dependable, we have four minutes. Reinken: Six. S: Six minutes. I see. I see you know the personnel equation of your watch. Then, are there any questions? Yes?

Q: You had said before you'd give an answer to the criticism of the Apology as a lie.

S: Well, what do you mean by that?

Q: It seems to me that the argument that you raised against the Apology, that it is a lie, and that it can't be answered by the argument that it's a work of art, an answer. In other words it seemed to me...

S: We cannot answer that. And I would say this, very provisionally. I would say we must make distinctions, a distinction made by Plato himself between base lies and noble lies. So if the Apology is a lie it is likely to be a noble lie. That would be the general line of defense of what I said which I would take.

Is this satisfactory for the time being? Yes.

Q: Well, you might speak a bit more about the unity of mathematics and

S: The unity?

Q: The agreement that mathematicians have about their own science.

S: Well this was the point when you read, for example, Descartes. I mean the situation today is I'm sure different. But in Descartes's time the situation was very clear. Take Euclid. There was no question--Euclid, that was the real stuff. I mean there could be no doubt about...I mean if you spoke mathematically, you accepted that--or Archimedes, or whoever it was. Whereas when you spoke of nature there were the great controversies between these great schools--Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, and so on. In this simple sense. I mean the complications which have arisen since the emergence of a non-Euclidean geometry and so on, that was not...Today the situation is visibly very different. The mere fact that today physics as a metaphysically neutral science is part of the establishment. And originally that was a great miracle that such a thing could happen. And we do not do justice to Galileo and his successors if we do not see first the paradox of this. Simply stated, what the people in the 17th century wanted--like Galileo, Descartes--was to replace a false or false philosophies by the true philosophy. Or more precisely, philosophy and science are synonymous terms up to this time. They tried to replace a false, a pseudo-philosophy and pseudo-science of Aristotle, and so on by the true, by a true philosophy or science. The result was--which became fully clear only in the 18th century--this enormous experiment was successful up to a point. And now in the 18th century, roughly, people began to say, "Let us call the successful part science and the failing part philosophy." And that's up to the present day, because what people who are entirely wedded to science is not philosophy. That's something--a branch of mathematics. Again, that's provisional. Now that is the last question.

Q: In the early parts of your introduction before you brought up the question of the sources of Socrates, you said, I believe, that if the modern democracy has worked out the problem of what I take is private morals and public morals, that this presupposes an elaboration in history of the...

S: No, from Hegel's point of view, I would say. And even independently of Hegel one can defend that, that this modern solution--say modern liberal democracy--presupposed this conflict between Socrates and the city, between philosophy and the non-philosophers, was carried out in all directions until only one way remained which one might try, and which was then tried in the 17th century. To make it a tiny bit more concrete, philosophy as understood by the classics is of direct use only to the philosophers themselves. I mean indirectly of course they can give good advice to other people. But the philosophers alone become happy through philosophy; the others don't become happy. They become a bit wiser if they listen to philosophers. Now what in the 17th century happened can be said as follows: Philosophy can make non-philosophers happy. How? Because the new philosophy or science is in the service of conquering nature--disease, death, and what have you.

And that by spreading these benefite, including deodorants, it makes everybody happy. And of course that was a nasty exaggeration of mine, but you understand it. And this is one of the key points, that science can now link up with what we call technology, whereas prior to that there was no essential link between science and technology.

Apology/Crito
Lecture 2

Now let us begin. In my introduction I have tried to explain with what expectations and concerns of our own we approach the Apology of Socrates and the Crito. Now today we shall turn to these Platonic works themselves. The procedure which we shall follow from now on is this: First Mr. Reinken will read to you a passage in Fowler's translation. Then I shall give a general explanation of the passage concerned. And finally I shall speak of particular expressions which seem to be in special need of a special discussion. From time to time I shall refer to the support...for support and otherwise to the commentary by John Burnet. Burnet was the editor of Plato, an outstanding authority. Yet I am compelled to question some of his fundamental assumptions, assumptions not peculiar to him, but which seem to be characteristic obstacles to our understanding of Plato, and therefore worthy of some discussion. I will give you a single illustration. Burnet has been very much concerned both in his commentaries and in his history of Greek philosophy with the question of the historical Socrates, as distinguished from, say, the Platonic Socrates, the legendary Socrates one could say. Now...And for the this purpose one must of course, in order to find out the true historical Socrates in contradistinction to the legendary Socrates, one must of course use extra-Platonic sources. And among them you...also Aristophanes' comedy The Clouds, which is referred to in the very text of the Apology. Now Burnet had the merit to take The Clouds much more seriously than most students. He rightly insisted on the fact that a comedy is of course not a historical report, and therefore one must be cautious. The historical report would give us facts and a comedy gives us jokes. And therefore this is one special difficulty. Unfortunately he goes beyond this. He says "Statements of fact are not funny." [Laughter] Now this is a consequence of the fact-value distinction, because funny is surely a predicate of value. It may be a negative value, but still it is not neutral. And I do not know whether Burnet knew it was a consequence of the fact-value distinction, but in fact it is. Now let us briefly consider this consequence or implication of the fact-values distinction. Is it true, as Burnet asserts, that statements of fact are never funny? Is it true? It would be true if there were never funny facts. [Laughter] We all know that there are funny facts. One could say--as I see from your reaction--the very statement, "Statements of fact are not funny" is itself a funny fact. [Laughter] I give you another example in the late most Grodzins book on loyalty, which some of you will know. Which is a strictly scientific book. He gives us an example in order to elucidate the problem of loyalty a story of waiters in fashionable downtown restaurants who have a kind of spitting contest, of course behind the scenes, who can spit burst from one wall to the next where the cocktails are located. Now this is, I must say, also a funny fact. It may not exhaust the description; it may also be criminal, for all I know, but in itself it doubtless has some funny qualities. So with this minor reminder of the limitations of Burnet's interpretation, we turn to the text. Now Mr. Reinken will be so good. And you are requested to open your books, too. To read the beginning of the Apology. You read until I say stop.

Reinken: "How you, men of Athens,...and an orator's virtue is to speak the truth." [18 a]

S: Thank you. Good. Here let us now stop. The judges, or the jurors--the same thing in this connection, in this context--were a large number, say [500 or more?]. This is perhaps therefore the reference to making noises,

making disturbances, so that he could really... this would not be contempt of court would be an action of the court. Good. Now the main point which Socrates seems here to make is this. The accusers are clever liars. In opposition to them Socrates is a simple-minded teller of the truth. Now if we generalize from that, the accusers are unjust; Socrates is just. And this simple opposition is elaborated by Plato in the second book of the Republic in a speech by Glaucon--not by Socrates--about the radical difference between the thoroughly unjust and the thoroughly just man. But this is in a way here presupposed, or implied, that there is such a radical and clear-cut difference. But more precisely, Socrates says the accusers are clever liars. The most impudent lie is their saying that Socrates is a clever liar. You see how he turns around. Here you have a clever liar and here you have a simple-minded man. Now the clever liars don't leave it at that. They of course say that they are not clever liars and say that the defendant is a clever liar. But this is the most impudent lie according to Socrates because Socrates will show here and now that he is not at all clever in speaking, which implies one thing: They said Socrates is a clever liar. And Socrates says "Now wait, after you have heard me speak." And what is the consequence of that? That the accusers are not clever liars. Because they will be refuted in half an hour or an hour. So the situation is more complicated than one thinks at first glance. In opposition to the accusers who are clever liars, Socrates is a straightforward teller of the truth, who avoids all artifices and fireworks. Socrates will tell the whole truth, as he says here and repeats frequently, and we may add, and nothing but the truth. Now why will he say the truth? And the first explanation he gives is this: He trusts that what he says are just things, in l7c 2-3. What does he imply? That the just things are most effective without any embellishment, without any fireworks or artifices. Let us take another example, disregarding Socrates. A man who defends himself--"I did not kill him. He was indeed killed with my gun. And I have no alibi." ["So clear?"]. This is a man who says the just thing, let us assume that this is the situation. Would each a man be able to overcome prejudice by merely saying these three things and sitting down? Especially in the case, which is likely, that the jury is prejudiced against him, because the prosecutor will make the most of these three things I mentioned, these points I mentioned, namely that it was his gun and he doesn't have an alibi. Good. So there is obviously some difficulty in this suggestion of Socrates, if you have a clear case you don't need artifice. That is not so simple. The second point which Socrates makes is, any artifices would not become a man of his old age. That's entirely different. So that may very well be true. So Socrates will then speak without adornment. And very tacitly, as he says, not out of disrespect for the court but out of respect for it. We understand that. He avoids all artifices; he will use the same speeches in his defense which he was accustomed to use both in the market place at the bankers' table, "where many of you have heard" him, "and elsewhere." Now here we must observe this difference. We do not know, of course, how many have heard Socrates in the market place. Because he doesn't say "All of you have heard me"; "many of you." We do not know how many. We are sure, however, that not many had heard him speak elsewhere, because the many doesn't refer to that. The many refers only to those who have heard him in the market place. Now the other places are in the gymnasia, you know, the training grounds where he talked to adolescents, and so on. This brings up the question for which we are not yet fully prepared, but which I mention, the question of the locale of Plato's dialogues as described in the Apology on the one hand, and as presented in all other dialogues on the other. Now this in passing. Now in his speech here he continues his point regarding his

old age. Now he says he could not speak differently than he will speak, for he has never before been before a court of law, and therefore he doesn't know forensic speech. A question: does one have to have been a defendant in order to know how to speak in a courtroom? I ask you. Well...yes?

A: He might have been one of the judges at one time.

S: Yes, as a matter of fact later on he will mention the fact that he was one of the judges in the trial of the generals of the battle of . Very well. So this is then not a very convincing reasoning. I'll come back to that later. I would like to bring up first one point which occurs at the end of what we must read. The jury should apply their mind to whether he says just things or not, meaning non-just things, unjust things, for this is the virtue of the judge, to see whether the speaker says just things. Whereas it is the duty of the speaker, of the orator, to say the true things. Now what Socrates does here is -- and also elsewhere, but not everywhere--is simply to identify the just things with the true things. This we have to consider, that identification, that unqualified identification, for a moment. As you will know, and you will hear *ed naussem* later, Socrates was accused of not believing in the gods of the city of Athens. Now then let us assume these gods are not true gods. Then of course...but Socrates was charged. And if he would say, "No, I don't believe in the gods as you generally understand them," then he would say the truth. But would he say the just things? The most superficial, but very--in a way most practically important meaning of the just things--are the things prescribed by law, legal things. Now if the law prescribes that you must recognize and revere the gods as worshipped by the city, then clearly the just (in the sense of legal) and the true would be very different. There is a profound ambiguity here.

Now what strikes us first in this whole speech, at least me, is Socrates' two-fold reference to his old age, and which explains his way of speaking. It would be unbecoming to a man of his age to speak cleverly. Now if it is only unbecoming, it means of course he could speak cleverly if he wished. I mean there are old men who have no sense of dignity and propriety and try to behave like adolescents, and Socrates could do the same. So in this first case he could speak cleverly if he wished. But later on when he speaks for the second time of his old age, he says he could not speak cleverly even if he wished because of his lack of forensic experience. So here there are clearly two incompatible alternatives. He could speak cleverly if he wished but it would be improper, and he could not speak cleverly even if he wished. Now which of the two alternatives is more credible, that he could speak cleverly if he wished or that he could not speak cleverly even if he wished? I think we have to give this some thought. What would you say? Well we have to go into the reasons. The reasons which Socrates gives, that he could not speak cleverly even if he wished, is that he has no forensic experience. And this means most immediately that he has never been a defendant before. But as we have...we know that he has been present at judicial proceedings and in one case which was mentioned, but in quite a few other cases. Socrates had a certain interest in forensic rhetoric and knew the orators of his day, also as the forensic orator. So I suggest provisionally that Socrates could speak cleverly if he wished, but he doesn't wish to. So this shows again that the simple opposition--the accusers are the clever liars, Socrates is a perfectly just man who is incapable of any cleverness, of such utmost simplicity--that this is too simple to be true. This alternative from which we started must be abandoned. Un-

qualified simplicity will not do. Well some people are counselled to take it do because they are so simple. But if one can help it one cannot leave it at that. This is not in any way a shocking thought. I remind you of the New Testament word of the simplicity of dogs and the guile of serpents. But the more immediate reason for this impossibility of unqualified simplicity is the questionable character of the equation of the just things with the true things. If the just things were identical with the true things, then simplicity might be much more possible than if they are not identical. So.

At this point I would like to read to you a comment from Burnet. "Another commentator has made this remark on this introduction. 'The introduction may be completely paralleled piece by piece from the orators.' [Not clear where the quote marks belong.] In other words it follows the convention. That is what ordinary men say, these kind of things, say, 'They have said lies, nothing but lies, and I will tell you the whole truth.' This is not a peculiarity of Socrates. Burnet adds to this the following remark: 'This observation is true and important, but the conclusion, 'that the subtle rhetoric of this defense would ill accord with the historical Socrates,' misses the mark.' You see here this kind of ghost, the historical Socrates, well you don't know how to get hold of. 'The truth is rather that the introduction is amongst other things a parody, and the very disclaimer of all knowledge of forensic diction is itself a parody. It is in fact impossible to doubt that Socrates was perfectly familiar with contemporary rhetoric, and that he thought very little of it.' Good. At any rate, a man who can make such a parody is without any question a clever speaker. [Laughter] I mean it is not a very high degree of, ...but he is surely not the perfectly simple minded man whom Socrates presents himself here.

Now a few points. He addresses the jury or the judges as "You Athenians," more literally, "You Athenian men." Hommes. Sometimes only simply, "You man," . The ordinary address is, "Judges," "Andres dikastei," "You men who are judges." Socrates does not address them as judges; he makes it clear later on toward the end. But this is not unique. I mean other orators not as sophisticated as Socrates have done the same. At the beginning when he says, or near the beginning, "And yet they have said, so to speak, nothing true." That's important. In other words they are not complete liars; that would be an exaggeration. And also later he says, "The many things they lied." Now the implication of this is of some importance. To say something absolutely untrue is impossible. Does this make sense? I mean in the practical meaning of the term, of course when you say someone has...we have seen him kill A and you have not seen him, then you say that's absolutely untrue. In this practical sense you can say something absolutely untrue. But Socrates' meaning goes deeper, or Plato's meaning goes deeper. All lying necessarily makes use of truth. Well to take the most simple implication, when you say "I have seen X killing someone," killing doubtless is an occurrence among human beings. Without this truth the whole lie would be impossible. That is not so trivial and elementary as it may seem at first sight.

There is another point which Burnet makes which I would like to read to you. Now regarding this passage when Socrates refers to his...that he will not behave like an adolescent, or like a very young man, fashioning speeches. And he says here, "This refers not to artificial language but to falsification. Such a young man to hide a fault uses falsehood and not rhetoric." The young man, Burnet adds, is the naughty boy, malrakion, the naughty boy, not the youthful orator, and this is the regular meaning of the expression, platon legous,

[telling?] or fashioning speeches. But let us consider the context. Socrates will say the whole truth, and he will forego all rhetorical artifices. All right. This is what Burnet implies. Now from this it follows that we have to make a distinction between two different, wholly separate things. And as a consequence a man may say the whole truth and yet use rhetorical devices. And on the other hand a man may not say the whole truth and yet forego rhetorical devices. There should be no difficulty. For example, the man who would lie would not say the whole truth, and yet forego rhetorical devices precisely in order to present himself as a plain, simple man. These are two very different things. But Socrates links up falsehood and rhetoric so strictly that the regular meaning of the phrase to which Burnet refers is not decisive. Socrates implies in the whole context here that using rhetoric, using artifices, is saying the untruth. And we have a very good proof of that, that this can be the Socratic meaning, from the dialogue Gorgias, in which there is an extensive presentation of the problem of rhetoric by Socrates toward a rhetorician called Polus in which he condemns rhetoric altogether as a form or kind of flattery, something ignoble and deceptive. So this much with a view...regarding this passage.

Now one more question, regarding 17c there is a point which Burnet makes of some interest. "Regarding the places where Socrates could be heard, many have heard him in the market place, and a few have heard him,"--a few is my addition-- "a few have heard him elsewhere. Euthyphron," Burnet says, a character in another Platonic dialogue, "is astonished to find Socrates in the market place instead of in a suburban gymnasium. Socrates was sometimes to be heard talking in the market place at the benches of the bankers," as he says here, "but his regular haunts were the gymnasium. It was there, and not in the market place or the streets of Athens, that his serious conversations took place." So this is of some importance. What many knew of Socrates was not his serious conversations. They knew the surface of the surface of the surface of Socrates, and if someone wanted to know a bit more he would have to meet Socrates "elsewhere." In that point Burnet only confirms what I have been trying to say. Yes, I think we can leave that. Yes. So this much I would like to say about the first part, the proemium, of the Apology. Now is there...Yes?

Q: I wanted to ask, as far as the connection between rhetoric and untruth, Socrates says at the end of that speech that it's the virtue of the orator to speak the truth. Now if the art of the orator is rhetoric, doesn't that contradict what he said previously? In other words he is implying that rhetoric is...

S: No, but here one can say...All right, but...Formally, yes, but he didn't use the word rhetor before, did he?

A: He uses it...for the orator, I believe...

S: Oh yes, you are quite right, in b 6 for example, surely. You are quite right. But he says there, "I would grant that I am an orator not like them," "not according to their standards." In other words...All right, then we have to say there are two kinds of rhetoric, Socratic rhetoric and bad rhetoric. And Socratic rhetoric consists in saying the truth and nothing but the truth and the whole truth. Are we do not get here.

Q: If you simply spoke the truth, that would be no different from speech.

That would not be rhetoric. That would not be rhetoric...

S: But he doesn't speak here of rhetorike, of the art of rhetoric; he speaks of an orator. Now some people are by nature orators, don't have any training in rhetoric. So then the question is...in other words, the point which you make is good. Whereas according to the discussion in the Gorgias in the section...and this long speech of Socrates to Polus, the impression is created that rhetoric is a sham throughout through, and nothing good can come of it. And here Socrates admits, as it were, there can be a good way of being an orator. Of course in the Gorgias, too, it becomes very clear when you read a bit on and a bit more carefully that Socrates also there regards rhetoric as a possibly good and respectable thing, although not what most people regard as rhetoric. That's another matter. Yes?

Q: When Socrates is talking about their rhetoric, he says his is not, as theirs is, finely tricked out or carefully arranged, so he seems to indict specifically the fact that their rhetoric depends upon, or what they convey depends upon the careful arrangement of the words and his is not going to be like that.

S: No he says...just whichever word occurs to him. No artificial...

Q: Which would mean...Yes, his rhetoric depends more on the substance of the...

S: But you see that that leads to certain difficulties if you consider that for one moment. If he simply speaks just what occurs to him, that could be a terrible disorder, and that would be a very ineffective speech, even if all individual points made were true. So he has to proceed in a somewhat orderly manner. And then as to his taking up any at random expression which occurs to him, there are also difficulties because of the...he may use...the wrong word may occur to him, a very ambiguous word which would do more harm than good. And in brief, as we have partly seen and as we will see more and more, this speech is not done at random. And whether maybe Socrates as presented here was such a first rate orator that he needed only 20 minutes concentrated thinking for planning it, that is impossible to say. But at any rate he knew at every step what he was doing, and we will see especially in the immediate sequel, when he begins to present to us the plan of his speech, which is the sign of some order. Good. But let us only keep this point in mind which I made in the beginning of this discussion, that the simple opposition of the clever liar and the simple minded sayer of the truth is too simple minded to fit the situation.

Now we come to the next section, 18a 7 to 19a 7. Will you read?

R: "First then it is right for me to defend myself. . .Anytus and the rest, though these also are dangerous: . . ."

S: "Anytus and the rest" are the official scousers, as you will see.

R: ". . .but those others. . .the things beneath the earth. . ."

S: "All things beneath the earth."

R: ". . .all things beneath the earth. . .the law must be obeyed and I must make a defence."

S: Yes. Now let us stop here. Prejudice is not a Greek word. I mention this in passing. The word is just slander. I mean the conception of prejudice you can say is...was implicitly available to the Greek philosophers, but the word doesn't exist there. That comes from the Latin tradition, and ultimately from the legal . But this in passing. Now Socrates had stated in the proemium in what spirit or with what etice he will speak. Now he sets forth the subject, the these, the thesis, of his speech. But is not the these obvious, namely, Socrates' defense? Of course. Therefore we have to be a bit more precise. He sets forth the plan of his speech. Plan means first this, then that, and so on and so on. One must make a division. The question arises how to divide. Now the defense is meant to refute the indictment, and the indictment itself was clearly divided into two parts as I say in advance. It accused Socrates of not believing in the gods of the city, and corrupting the young. And Xenophon in his *Memorabilia*, the first two chapters, draws up the defense of Socrates very properly. First the charge of impiety, chapter one, and then the charge of corruption, chapter two. But Plato's Socrates does not follow the division of the indictment, for reasons which will appear later. He follows the division not of the indictment, but of the indictors, the accusers, the two kinds of accusers. Now the first kind were more important, more dangerous, than the present ones. And he gives some reasons for that. In the first place, their charge, which you have read, that there is a Socrates who investigated things beneath the earth and makes the weaker speech stronger, i.e., teaches you rhetorical tricks, dialectical tricks, their charge leads people to believe that Socrates is simply impious or an atheist. And of course, as we shall see later, the present accusers hadn't done that properly. What they say, Socrates says, is simply untrue. Of the present accusers he had said, "They have said so to speak nothing untrue." Here Socrates is much stricter and says they have said there is nothing true, i.e., he has nothing to do with all these things mentioned by them. The second point why the first accusers are more dangerous than the present one is this: the first accusers are many, and have been active for a long time, which implies the present accusers are few and have been active for a short time. The first accusers thus have created a powerful prejudice against Socrates, a prejudice with which the judges are filled. The first accusers must belong, it appears from the context, to the older generation, because some of you have been filled with a prejudice against Socrates when you were children or adolescents. Quite a few of these accusers, of course, might belong to the jury. Quite a few, even if now dead, may have been the fathers of Socrates' judges. The third point: The first accusers are nameless, except the utterly uninteresting case of a comic poet like Aristophanes, because they make fun and, as we know, statements of...funny statements are not to be taken seriously. The first accusers are nameless. Socrates is completely silent as to whether these first accusers were ever contradicted. He creates the impression, surely, that the slander by the first accusers was never contradicted. Now since they are unknown, Socrates cannot cross examine them, or refute them. That makes sense. Now how important is this fact? Socrates knows what the first accusers charged him with. Let us repeat that point, that there is some Socrates, a certain Socrates, a wise man, who worries about the things aloft and has investigated all things beneath the earth, and who makes the weaker logos, the weaker speech, into the stronger speech. Socrates knows what he is charged with. Hence he can refute that charge without--who cares who made the charge?--he knows the charge. He shows in the sequel, we will hear it soon, that the charge is entirely baseless, or as he put it here, that they have said something which contains not a grain of truth.

But why was that charge made at all if it is so entirely baseless? Why did Socrates become the target of a well-nigh universal slander? And of this particular slander? I mean he could have been accused of embezzling public money; that would be something. But he was accused of this thing. Only the first accusers could answer this question. Is it not so? Because they that. So as a consequence Socrates can defend himself against their charge, but since they are unknown--not even their names are known--they cannot defend themselves against Socrates' refutation. So we listen to Socrates, we hear how he refutes the charge, but we will never hear what the original accusers had to say in support of their accusation. Furthermore the men who slandered him were many, as he emphasises. Now many men had heard him talk at the bankers' tables in the market place, as distinguished from other places. Now I make this suggestion, and I am of course eager to discuss it with you. I would bet that Socrates did not worry about the things aloft and investigate the things beneath the earth, etc. on the market place. So the many could not have had any first hand knowledge of what Socrates did elsewhere. But could they not have heard of what Socrates did elsewhere? From others. And perhaps this was distorted on the way to town, that's another matter. However this may be, the first accusers' charge, as brought forward by thee, was necessarily baseless, because they could not have any direct knowledge. But this we cannot exclude without considering the evidence, especially the evidence supplied by the *Apology*, there may have been some tiny little wee bit of fire where there was so much smoke. We must see.

Now the first charge, the charge of the first accusers, had certain consequences. The consequence is distinguished from the first charge. In o 3 this is made perfectly clear. The first accusers only said that Socrates is investigating these and these things, and so on. But the charge that Socrates does not worship the gods was not made by the first accusers. That is an inference on the part of the listeners. But however this may be, perhaps it was an inevitable consequence, when the men went around and said, "There is a Socrates who worries about the things aloft," or as it is called in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, "who looks down on sun and moon," meaning looks down with contempt, sun and moon being divine beings; then such a man cannot worship, cannot have true respect of the gods. Now let us consider the charge of the second accusers for one moment. The second accusers said that Socrates does not respect or worship the gods worshipped by the city of Athens. Now compare this with the charge of the first accusers and its inevitable consequence. The first accusers' charge plus its inevitable consequence was much graver, because here it is said Socrates didn't believe in any gods, and not merely not in the gods of the city. And this is very strange. And by bringing in the first accusers, Socrates therefore aggravates the situation, because the first accusers went much further than the second. Yet this shows of course also, one can say, his singular honesty. He wants to surprise the audience with all the evidence, without holding back anything. He wants to meet the whole charge, not merely the formal charge, which conceivably might be still drawn up, as we will see later. Yet on the other hand, we must not forget, the first accusers cannot rebut Socrates' refutation, for the simple reason that they are nameless. They are as... They can as easily be brought on the witness stand as air.

Now here is another point which Burnet makes, which I would like briefly to discuss. He quotes another commentator, [sounds like "Shance"/], who says, "One thing may be taken as incontrovertible, that the sin of every

defense must be before everything else to weaken the accusation as far as to secure an acquittal. If the case of the accused is not a strong one, he will at least attempt to produce an appearance of refutation. But no accused person will amplify still further the counts on which he is being prosecuted, or alter then in such a way as to add substantially to the difficulties of his defense. And yet both these things are done in the Apology." This is a remark of an older commentator which I think is correct. Burnet says, "In other words, ^{he} has made the discover that the Apology is not a defense at all, and he thinks that the aim of Socrates must have been to get off at any cost. The fact remains, however, that he did not get off, though it is clear that he could have done so if he had cared to adopt the line of defense ^{would have advised}. No doubt Lyceus, a famous contemporary orator, would have given similar advice if there is any truth in the statement that he offered to compose a speech for Socrates to deliver at the trial." And Socrates declined. "The judgement of Grote"--George Grote, History of Greece, "is as usual far sounder. He says, 'No one who reads the Platonic Apology of Socrates will ever wish that he had made any other defense.' But it is the speech of one who deliberately foregoes the immediate purpose of a defense," namely, persuasion of his judges. This much, Grote. "In fact, as Plato represents the matter, Socrates would have been glad to secure an acquittal, if that could be done without stooping to ^{the compromises which would give the} lie to his whole life. But he did not believe the object of life was to live a given length of time," in other words, to live on and on and on. "That being so his defense was such as it must be." [The transcriber has only guessed at where the quotation marks belong as they were not made explicit.] Well I think this is ...you see there is a difficulty here. We can leave it at the time being at this point. What Burnet says is quite true as far as it goes. But he omits one important piece of evidence. He discusses at some length the presentation of Socrates' defense as given by Xenophon in Xenophon's Apology of Socrates, and so on. I do not have to go into that. But I take a piece of Platonic evidence. Gorgias, 521d 6 to 522e 8, where Socrates describes many years in advance the situation in which he would be if, as could be predicted, he would be accused. And someone to whom he talks, a man called Callicles, accuses him, because he would be utterly helpless if accused, and says to Socrates "Is it not disgraceful for a man to be utterly helpless? Must he not therefore engage in the theory and practice of forensic rhetoric in order to meet such contingencies?" Now why is it impossible, according to Socrates? Socrates compares his situation when he is accused to a physician who would be accused by a candy maker to a bunch of kids. And the candy makers "I am the man who gives you these candies. And you give these bitter medicines and injections, and whatever." What would the kids say? Of course they would believe the candy maker, and not the physician. That is...You may read it; it is a very powerful statement. But let us consider for our moment the implication. If this is a true description, a true simile, then the question arises, can the Athenian jury understand Socrates' doings as Socrates meant them? And the answer, I believe, would have to be "No." And this would be...Surely Socrates didn't wish to do anything undignified, improper; he would not beg the kids to let him off. But on the other hand he would like to say to them the whole truth and nothing but the truth. But they would be wholly unable to follow him. And therefore Socrates would be compelled to speak in a crude way. And therefore also, for more thinking people, in a misleading way, to his judges. The frank statement of the truth, would in the circumstances be nothing but useless provocation, or, to use a term which Xenophon uses of Socrates' defense speech as he presents it,

"talking big," "boasting." And this of course would also be an impropriety. Now let us see, there are two passages which we have to discuss. At the beginning of this section here, when he says "In the first place"--I translate literally--"I am just in making a speech of defense." Now what does this mean--"I am just"? How does he translate it?

R: "It is right for me."

S: "Right for me," all right. But there is a certain ambiguity. Does this mean "I have a right to make a speech of defense," or "I have a duty," "I'm under an obligation to make a speech of defense"? How would you understand that? The Greek word is ambiguous. But is there a difference of emphasis, what would be the emphasis? A: Right? S: No, I think as the end of this passage shows, which we read, one must obey the nomos, law, and make a speech of defense. In other words it is Socrates' legal duty.

Now Anytus is the chief accuser, as we see here. But in the Apology of Socrates he remains in the background. The accuser whom Socrates cross examines later is Meletus. In order to see and to understand the relation of Socrates and Anytus as Plato saw it, one would have to study the dialogue Meno, where Anytus occurs years before the trial in a conversation with Socrates. I repeat, the first accusers did not say that Socrates is an atheist, as you see from b 6 to c 3. This was merely an inference of the part of the wholly ignorant listeners. Because the men who spread this rumor were not wholly ignorant; they had heard in one way or the other from very suspicious sources that Socrates was doing...worrying about the things aloft. This one part of the accusation, to make the weaker speech the stronger, was a claim made originally by a man called Protagoras, the most famous of all sophists. And that means, according to the ordinary understanding, to make the unjust speech superior, the unjust reasoning, superior to the just reasoning. Now this is of course what unfortunately, or necessarily, every defense lawyer does. At least forensic rhetoric in so far as it serves guilty men. It tries to show that their cause is stronger and overcomes the law. When he speaks then around c 8 to d 4, when he says that it is not possible to mention their name, to know and to say their name, except if one of them happens to be a comic poet. Now the other people...he goes on. "But those who, using envy and slander, have persuaded you, and others were sincerely persuaded," i.e., were not prompted by envy. So this implies, it seems, that the comic poets in question did not make use of envy and slander, nor did they sincerely accuse Socrates. Well what was then the motivation of the comic poets if it was not to slander Socrates out of envy, or because they were sincerely convinced of his guilt? Well of course the comic poets want to make people laugh, and Socrates was in a sense a ridiculous figure. And he was a god-send, so to speak, to the comic poets. The question is whether this is sufficient as an explanation. I will not go into that now because we have not sufficient evidence for that hitherto, but I would like to raise the question which we must raise on the basis of this passage here, since Socrates refers to it explicitly, why were people envious of Socrates? He will say later on that he lives in extreme poverty. He was also very ugly. And so why should people be...And he had no exalted position politically or otherwise. Why should people be envious of Socrates? I know only one passage where the question is answered in an indirect way, and that is in Xenophon's Education of Cyrus, Book Three, Chapter one, section 39, in which Xenophon speaks not of the

case of Socratee in particular, but of a sophist who had been killed by some king deep in Asia. And Cyrus, the conqueror of this country, asks the son of that king, "Why did your father kill him?" And then he said, "Well, I admired that sophist more than my father, the king. And therefore he was envious of him, and since he was a powerful potentate he could easily kill him." So in other words there was a kind of envy of some fathers which must have played a role, as we shall see later.

Now at the end of this passage here, Socrates asks, as it were, for a special favor, namely, that the jury admit the existence of the first kind of accusers, of which they of course didn't know anything, and then permit him to deal first with these first accusers. He emphasizes the fact, which you cannot see from the English translation but it is clear in the original, in d 6 and e 1, hosper ego lego, he emphasizes the fact that he is the one who speaks of the first accusers. Ha, "as I say." Was he the first to speak of the first accusers? Was he the one who discovered their existence? A question which we must not forget, although we are not yet in a position to answer it. The final statement in 19a or so implies that the whole jury, whole body of judges, is prejudiced against Socrates, because they have been exposed from their youth and even from their childhood on to that never contradicted slander that Socrates does these and these things, which led then, the listeners, necessarily to the inference that Socrates did not believe in gods. The whole jury is prejudiced against Socrates, and that, he says, here [right?] at the beginning of the...of his whole speech, as was the traditional rule of rhetoric that you should begin a speech, forensic or not, with a captatio benevolentiae, with an attempt to win the good will of the audience. Now when you begin by saying, not exactly like a present day juvenile delinquent, "You all hate me," but almost like it, it's so to speak it's mature equivalent, that is not a very good attempt to win the good will. And Socrates admits, of course, by this very fact, and that's very important, that he knows that his case is well-nigh hopeless because of this prejudice.

In 19a toward the end of the passage,, "I wish that this would so happen that I could free you from that prejudice, if it is better, in any way, for you or for me." Socrates would...he is not unqualifiedly eager to be acquitted. He says, "if it is good for you and for me." Perhaps his acquittal would not be good for him, and/or the city. Only the god knows. And therefore that is not the key point. Again I remind you of a brief scene from the Gorgias. We take it for granted that a pilot who brings us, say, from an island to the mainland of Greece, is a great benefactor of ours, because if the boat had been sunk we would have perished and--terrible. But of course we do not know whether our salvation is not the beginning of much greater misery than an early grave, if wetery grave. So at the end Socrates defends himself not because he wishes to be acquitted--that he makes quite clear--but because to defend himself is his legal duty. I mention...summarize a key point here. Socrates defends himself, as he indicates, against the charge that he is an atheist before a jury that is convinced that he is an atheist. This is the grave situation, the almost hopeless situation, in which Socratee finds himself. Mr. Bruell?

Bruell: With respect to what you just said, if he defends himself only because it's his legal duty, why does he then refer to the first set of accusers? He may not but he could have limited himself.

S: All right, if it is his duty to...his legal duty to defend himself, that means of course that he cannot defend himself in a perfunctory manner. He must do it properly; otherwise he would not fulfill his legal duty. And therefore he must put the whole charge before them, and especially if the accusers are inept and have not been able to verbalize the charge properly, he must do that properly. Does it not make sense? Yes?

Bruell: This is on another point. In d 2, who is influenced by the envy and the slander? Are the people he's speaking to...

S: The first accusers; a part of the first accusers.

Bruell: It's not just that they use envy and slander to convince others. Does he give that as the original motivation?

S: Not of all. Some people were convinced...sincerely believed that Socrates did these unsavory things. And that he was worrying about the things aloft—that means the heavenly bodies and their motions, and so on—and investigating the things beneath the earth, etc.—some people believed that. How they came to believe it: no indication. We will have to do some figuring out when we come to the refutation. Yes? Bruell: That's what I was interested...Which...

S: But there could be people who were simply...I mean somehow it came...they were told that Socrates did these things. And then he said, "What a terrible man." They believed. Others were envious of him before they heard that and used this rumor in order to slander Socrates.

Bruell: But that seems to indicate that the people who were envious had first hand knowledge, whereas the people who were honestly convinced are convinced only by hearsay.

S: That makes sense. I believe he doesn't prove it exactly, at least as far as I can see. But it is a plausible distinction. Yes. And this envy I think plays a role. We'll come to that subject later on; I mention now only the passage from Xenophon, but it's also in Plato. Yes?

Q: If Socrates wishes his acquittal only if it's good for him and the city, then does that change the basis of the trial, or the basis on which Socrates... Well, Socrates idea of the trial, then, is not that it is going to decide anything just, or decide on matters of justice or truth, because Socrates, irrespective of whether his acquittal would be either just or truth, he wants his acquittal only if it's good for the city.

S: But he cannot know what is good. He cannot know. I mean, in other words, he cannot know whether by having been executed when he was 70 he was not spared a terrible cancer a few weeks later, or something on the equivalent of that. He cannot know that. He means that.

Q: But still he is willing to say, though, that if—even though he cannot know it—if it were better for the city...

S: But he doesn't make this clear; he only alludes to it. He says at the end of this passage, "Nevertheless this may go as it is pleasing to the god."

Meaning that the god, presupposing that he is favorably disposed toward Socrates and Athens--which we do not know but which Socrates here assumes, he will do the best for Socrates and the city of Athens, or if there is some conflict, for one of the two. Is this clear?

A: Fairly clear. But my problem with that statement is that then I wonder what...how Socrates envisions things being pleasing to God...

S: That he cannot know. I mean he will discuss this later, that he cannot know; that he could perhaps know after death, where he lands, in a hot place or in a pleasant place. That he cannot know in this life. But he is sure that...he presupposes that nothing will happen, nothing bad will happen, to any man or any city which is not hated by the gods. Or at least to which the gods are not indifferent. Of course this is a great question, how much are the gods interested in the city of Athens and in Socrates? We cannot answer the question on the basis of this remark. That is exactly a part of a popular speech that he cannot go into these questions to any extent. From time to time we will have to turn to the other dialogues in order to clarify this kind of questions. But does it not make sense in itself, without...I mean that there are infinite problems concealed, there is no question. But simply say, "I cannot honestly wish to live longer, because I do not know whether it is good for me." Especially in the case of an old man, but also perhaps of young. "And then I trust in God," as we say, or "in the gods," as the Greeks say. That they are not vicious, not full of malice. And that is one. But now what then shall I do, since I cannot know what the gods have in mind, what they intend with me? I can only obey the law. Now the law--this is again an ambiguous word. It can mean law of the polis: it can also mean something which was called...came to be called the natural law. In other words there is something of the will of the gods is known to me. But not the whole. And especially not the future fate and what they intend. We'll come to that when he speaks toward the end of the book, what he believes to be his fate after death. He takes this up.

Q: Isn't there a conflict of values here? On the one hand what he has already said earlier about truth, and that it is the duty of the orator to speak justly, and in particular the duty of the jury to judge justly, that is to judge whether it's the truth. And here where he is at least in effect giving up and saying that the jury is going to decide, and he evidently thinks it should decide, in accordance with--you know--whether it's good for the city or for himself. That is, what he's saying here is that the jury ought to decide...he doesn't want to be acquitted unless it is for the good.

S: Well what he says, let us repeat that. "I would wish that this might so happen," meaning in the context that "I might be acquitted." I mean Socrates has the simple disinclination...aversion to dying, and especially to being executed, which most human beings have. He would wish that. But, being a thoughtful man, he makes a qualification, because he doesn't know what his future might bring. He might become very miserable. He has three kids, and what kind of troubles might he live to see when he would live ten years longer, you know? Read any daily paper to see the simple wisdom which is here presupposed. So he says, "I would wish to be acquitted if it were better for me." But he includes also the polis, the city, and says, "If it were better for you." This has the grave implication, maybe it is better for the city of Athens that Socrates is executed. What would that mean?

A: The problem here I see is the dilemma for the jury, where on the one hand

they're exhorted that their duty is to judge justly, where on the other hand Socrates is saying that their duty is also to judge in accordance with what would be good for the city.

S: No. He is not speaking of their duty at all, here. He is speaking here of wishes. Their duty is to judge justly. But what one could wish is something different. You know? That is something different. But it is quite good that you drew our attention to the passage.

Q: When you say that Socrates aggravates the charges against him, in that the first accusers accuse him of believing in no gods....

S: But it is more subtle than that. They say...Explicitly they don't say that.

A: They say something which leads others to infer.

S: Which compels, almost, the listener to draw the inference. All right.

Q: This is aggravating the original charge, which had been only that he didn't believe in the gods of Athens. S: Let us say the actual charge. Because if we believe Socrates we must assume that there were first accusers. Q: But if he can defend himself against the actual charge, then it would be easier...In other words it would be easier to defend oneself against the charge that you believe in no gods than against the charge that you don't believe in certain specific gods.

S: That is true. But the problem is this: If the jury is convinced that he is a downright atheist, I mean if he has to fight this prejudice in the short time, well say an hour's time, a prejudice built up in generations, so to speak, what a hopeless task. This is I think the main point he wishes to make. You see if the first charge had been minor, less grave than the second charge, then the refutation of the second charge would be the only thing which counts. And this refutation is possible because he knows the author of the charge, this present accuser, Meletus, and he will cross examine him. But here he is confronted with a much broader charge, much more hopeless charge, and he cannot possibly cross examine the originators of that charge. Yes?

Q: But by pointing out to his judges the prejudices which have been built up over a long period of time and that will undoubtedly influence their decision, isn't he hoping to have these judges to re-examine their own conscience, to re-examine their own values, and to see if these prejudices which have been built up for so long really do hold any truth? So rather than compounding the charges against him, hasn't he really reached a much more significant point by having the judges re-examine their own feelings and values?

S: Well, I can only say, take a case...conscience and all this kind of thing. ...Well, I think that very few people directly act against the clear dictate of the conscience, you know that? But there is unfortunately a sophistry of the conscience. And quite a few things look as moral demands which are not moral demands strictly speaking. Take the situation...I mean I want to put it as gently as I can. Take the situation as it was 20 years ago in the state of Mississippi regarding an accused Negro. And let us assume that he was a man of legal training

and very able. Do you believe that he could have disposed of the prejudice against Socrates within one speech, and especially if the evil...I mean, hopeless. Now surely ethicalism and being a Negro are two very different things. But they have this in common that they are prejudices built up by many men in a long time. And by bringing this point up here--Socrates, you see. I mean there is as it were a surface. The surface is that three men mentioned by name later, Anytus and the others, have accused Socrates of this and this crime, which will be formulated later on. Socrates can refute that. And he can even ask the accuser to stand up and answer his cross examination. And Socrates refutes him, as we will see. But now Socrates says, "this is only the top of an iceberg, utterly uninteresting." The iceberg is the first charge, and this first charge is much bigger. Bigger, and at the same time it is impossible to cross examine the accusers. So he can only say, "I didn't worry about the things aloft; I didn't dig up the earth for onions, or whatever it might be, and so on. I never did any of these things." But that is exactly the case of the man I mentioned before who says, "I didn't kill him. I admit he was killed with my gun, and I admit I have no alibi." Then what is the use of his full sincerity? Can't overcome the prejudice.

Q: Well doesn't it relate more or less to what Socrates' view of man is? That he will never err willingly, that if he is shown the right way through knowledge, that he will see what the truth is? So that he would assume that if he couldn't show these men their prejudices and then correct them...

S: That is not...I mean that is I would say a kind of fairy tale story about Socrates, which I know occurs in even some scholarly books, or books supplied with scholarly [apparatus?]. But Socrates was...That we can be certain: Socrates was not a simple minded, naive man. And he knows...I mean this simple thing which became so famous in the works of Hobbes--how did he say? If a truth...

R: "So oft as reason is against a man, so oft will a man be against reason."

S: You can be sure that while the formulation stems from Hobbes, the insight itself was thoroughly known to Socrates, that you cannot take away deep seated prejudices in a few...I mean you can silence people. That Socrates does easily because he is the supreme dialectician. He silences everyone. But that doesn't mean convince them. I mean read only...For example, read the Gorgias. Callicles is a very good example. Callicles is silenced with some difficulty by Socrates, but he is never for one moment convinced. Or take Thrasymachus in the first book of the Republic. Some of you will have read it. Socrates silences him, but is Thrasymachus convinced? That's another matter. There must be some common ground to begin with for [conviction?]. If there is no...Well of course we can say there is some common ground between all human beings, and Socrates was of course the first to say that. But this common ground may not be sufficient to overcome the serious prejudices. For instance the common ground is shown by the fact that there is no one here who for one moment would doubt that it is today the 20th of October, a Thursday, and so and so many people are in this room. Unless someone cannot count or is blind or something. But every normal human being we can say would of course admit that. But what is the use of this kind of agreements, and we can enunciate millions of facts where we all agree, and yet what is the use of that when we come up against prejudices? So that I would say...I repeat their sentence. Socrates defends himself against...First of all he enlarges the charge by bringing in the first accusers, and then he makes clear while enlarging it that the defense

against the first accusers is hopeless because of the deep-seated character of the prejudice. So it might be after he has refuted the first accusers, it might be possible for Socrates to refute the present accusers. But still the iceberg proper remains untouched by whatever success he might have with the second accusers. So we have to stop here unfortunately. Well, but if you have questions I ask you to jot them down and bring them to our attention at the next class. And we will then turn to the defense against the old accusers.

We discussed last time the first part of the Apology, which consists of two sections, as you have seen--the proemium proper and the presentation of the theme, which means in this case of the plan. Now Socrates opens his defense by the simple opposition of his accusers as clever liars and himself as a straight-forward, simple teller of the truth. But he asserts at once that his accusers are not clever liars in as much as they presented Socrates as a clever speaker or a clever liar. The simple opposition with which he starts is questionable, and this applies not only to the accusers but to Socrates as well. Yet the fact that the accusers are not clever liars is not of great help, if of any help, to Socrates. And this comes out through the plan of Socrates' defense, which is divided into two parts, but not because the charge is bi-partite. Socrates follows rather a bi-partition of the accusers, which he establishes. The accusers can appeal to a very powerful, to an all-powerful prejudice against Socrates, a prejudice created by the first accusers. Hence Socrates' telling the truth is doomed to failure from the beginning. How can you take care of an all-powerful prejudice by a single speech? By bringing in the first accusers Socrates aggravates his situation. Especially for this reason: for the first accusers led the Athenians to believe that Socrates does not believe at all in any god, whereas the charge is that Socrates doesn't believe in the gods of the city. Yet here is the strange fact. The first accusers did not accuse Socrates of atheism, of unqualified atheism. This was an inference on the part of those who listened to the first accusers. These listeners, in contradistinction to the first accusers, were people who knew absolutely nothing of Socrates...of what Socrates was doing or saying. They just heard that there is a man called Socrates who does these and these things, and then they jump at the conclusion, hence he is an atheist. We are then compelled to make a fundamental distinction between the listeners and the first accusers, and to wonder whether the first accusers were not closer to the source than the mere listeners. At any rate, these first accusers knew that one may study the things aloft and beneath the earth, etc., and yet believe in gods; otherwise they would themselves have brought forth this inference. One can say the first accusers were more sophisticated, more educated, than the listeners. I remind you here again of the distinction which Socrates makes between the many who heard him talk in the market place and the few who heard him elsewhere. But the first accusers, however superior to the listeners, are nameless, unknown, and they were many. They were surely...They were more likely to belong to those who heard Socrates speak on the market place, because the many had heard him there. This would mean that the persecutors knew nothing of Socrates first-hand; they were as much groping in the dark, and moreover perhaps even, than the mere listeners. They surely are utterly untrustworthy, because they have no first-hand knowledge. Yet...And so one can easily dispose of them. The trouble is that because they are many and unknown, they cannot be cross examined, and Socrates must therefore leave it at a mere denial of their accusation. He cannot cross examine. Now this is a summary of what I believe are the most important points made last time. But there seem to be some other points, and some young men hailing from Cornell have brought up some point. Did you find a spokesman? Pardon?

Q: Well, the point that we were wondering about most was, we discussed just what this phrase about come either being affected by or making use of envy and slander, persuaded them. And we came out very uncertain as to what that meant, whether it was using or just being subject to envy and slander, and how many groups of accusers this indicated.

S: Yes. Now in other words he makes here a distinction first between two classes, first people honestly convinced. That's the first distinction. And, i.e., honestly convinced that Socrates was studying the things aloft, and so on. And therefore they somehow seem to find this terrible. And so that e men who studie the things aloft and beneath the earth, and so on, such a fellow is capable of anything. And yet there were other people who were not honestly convinced, but they slandered Socrates, used slander and envy. They slandered Socrates out of envy. I mean the two things are simply coordinated. So there were people who for one reason or another were hostile to Socrates. And a reason is indicated, namely, envy. Perhaps they envied a man who knows his way into things aloft and beneath the earth, and therefore they slandered him. Or another reason. Later on, as we will see, Socrates will give a reason which has nothing whatever to do with his being a student of nature why people were hostile to him. And for this reason abused him falsely, insincerely, of being a student of the things aloft. But we have not yet reached that point. So we must postpone ... But there is a difficulty, without any question. And the difficulty is in a way evolved in the next large section of the Apology where Socrates refutes the first accusers. Their charge is baseless. And then the question of course arises, "But how come that you are so unpopular if you do not do anything out of the ordinary. And then Socrates tells them of what he did, the famous story of his being the gadfly examining all opinions. And then the debunked opinions not wishing to admit that they had been debunked, invent out of nothing the charge that Socrates is a man who investigates the things aloft, and therefore is also an atheist. But this is a later explanation. We have to stick first to what we have read.

But there was another point, if I remember what I learned privately from Mr. Bruell, which you figured out about the first part of the Apology.

Bruell: I think that was with reference to the first...to the proemium proper, that there was a massive contradiction in the fact that Socrates said that his accusers will be refuted by his manner, which is that of a simple truth-teller, and then in the second part he says, "Well don't bother about the manner in which I speak. You may not like that, but pay attention to what is just. . ."

S: So what would be...State the skeleton of the contradiction.

Bruell: That he says first, "Watch the way I speak." S: Do not pay attention to it. Bruell: "Do pay attention to the way I speak." And in the second part he says, explicitly, "Please don't bother about the way I speak."

S: Yes. All right. There is of course...the context is slightly different but I have nothing against this abstract statement. Now how does this link up with the other point we found out, regarding the proemium?

Bruell: Well it seems to me that this might be a possible explanation, that he first states the case as one would wish it to be, that a person who tells the truth could without any rhetoric, stand before a court and be justified, be acquitted. And in the second part he states the case as it actually is, that the truth is very complicated, that even to try to state the truth before such a court is a very questionable affair and might bring him into dispute. And in the second part he indicates that...he grants to the Athenians that they have the duty

or the right to judge the justice of what he says, but not the truth.

S: Yes. Good. Now then let us proceed, if it is all right with you. And first, Socrates following his plan, defends himself against the old accusers, in 19a 8 to 24b 2. And this is again divided into two parts. First he refutes the old charge, 19a 8 to 20c 3. And the result is the charge is wholly baseless. And then this leads to the question, "But why then the slander of Socrates? What did Socrates do that made him the target of slander?" 20c 4 to 24b 2. That's...the second part is much more extensive as we will see. Now let us turn to the refutation of the old charge in 19a 8. And this refutation of the old charge itself consists again of two parts. That is very strange, how much the principle of bi-partition goes through this work, at least in the first half, and this is probably connected with the fact that the charge itself is bi-partite. Now let us read this first section from 19a 8 on. Mr. Reinken?

Reinken: "Now let us take up from the beginning...this suit against me."

S: So here it is perfectly...Maeletus, the present accuser, bases himself on the previous accusation. Yes.

R: "What did those who aroused the slander...that the many say about me."

S: Yes. Now you see, atheism is here not part of the charge, which confirms what we have seen before. Atheism was only an inference on the part of the listeners. The content of the old charge is in the main the same as the presentation of Socrates in Aristophanes' Clouds, as he makes quite clear. But in the Clouds Socrates is presented as saying many non-sensical things, and that cannot be...that he is walking on the air, what does this mean? I mean that shows it is just a funny and ridiculous assertion. But what the old charge ascribed to Socrates is not nonsense. That Socrates makes quite clear. But something quite respectable. And so he says, "What is that respectable thing?" Now I mention one point in passing which is here only implied. In the Clouds Socrates is presented as saying all kinds of ridiculous things, surely. But he is also presented as denying the existence of Zeus and the other gods. Socrates does not mention this in any way. As a commentator early in this century has said, Socrates does not mention it, prudenter consilio [?], out of a prudent consideration. Now what is that respectable thing which Socrates does not do, but which is not bad [do?]? Knowledge of the things aloft and of the things beneath the earth. This is something all right. But the accusation was also that he was trying to make the weaker speech the stronger one. Is this also something fine and respectable? Socrates does not make any distinction here between knowledge of the things aloft on the one hand, and this kind of rhetoric on the other. Socrates clearly implies that he would not act unjustly, or criminally, by devoting himself to such knowledge or science, c 6. Namely, science of the things aloft, of the things beneath the earth, and perhaps making the weaker speech the stronger one. Perhaps in doing... the accusers had said that Socrates acts unjustly and acts as a busybody, or lavishes useless pain in doing these things. Perhaps he would act as a busybody in doing that without acting as a criminal, for one could say men's business is on the earth, not in heaven, nor beneath the earth. Unless he were to look beneath the earth for onions, coal, or oil. That would also be men's business, naturally. But this use of this kind of knowledge or science is not considered here at all.

Now the old accusers charge him with indulging in innocent pastime, one can say--perhaps not very fitting for a self-respecting citizen, but not by any means criminal. More precisely, the old accusers, according to the presentation here, did not accuse him at all. The true old accusers, we recall, are the listeners to the so-called old accusers, and these listeners were the bulk of the Athenians. They drew the inference from Socrates' funny or strange doings that he must be an atheist.

Now what is Socrates' defense against this charge (in quotes)? He does not possess this kind of knowledge or science. And he proves this through witnesses. Who are the witnesses? Answer: the bulk of the Athenians. The bulk of the jury. Or at least those many among them who ever heard him talk, and the many who heard him talk were those who heard him on the agora, the marketplace. We can say Socrates appeals from the prejudice of the many to the knowledge of the many. But as is implied in everything else, that knowledge which they had did not have the slightest effect on their prejudice hitherto, for such a long time; is it likely to have any effect now? Socrates claims complete ignorance of physiologia, of knowledge or study of nature. But this is contradicted by a well-known statement of Socrates a short while later, following the internal time of the dialogue. On the day of his death, described in the Phaedo, he speaks of his passionate concern in his youth with physiologia. Now of course this was no longer his concern now we can say. But we know that the first accusers were the old accusers, that is to say, men who know the young Socrates, and perhaps only the young Socrates. And this young Socrates was very much concerned with the things aloft and the things beneath the earth. And the Socrates presented in the Clouds is in this sense the young Socrates. Now here is a note of Burnet on 19d 5. "Those who want to look it up can easily do it, because the passages are indicated here. 'The attitude of Socrates being such as is described here, and at greater length in the Phaedo, we may be sure that he never talked about these matters in public.' Surely, I believe that, and I think Socrates alludes to this fact by making a distinction between the many who heard him talk on the market place, and those who heard him talk elsewhere. But the question is much more. Socrates says now, 'Not only did I ever talk about these matters in public, I said 'I know nothing of that,' which is a very different proposition. 'It is practically only in such things as the myth of the Phaedo that Socrates is made to betray his knowledge of contemporary science.' Well that is another matter, that Socrates is made to betray his knowledge of contemporary science, and that simple denial of his knowledge of contemporary science, if we can use that term."

Now you have seen also some new thing here. It is part of the charge by the old accusers that Socrates is teaching others these things--the things aloft, and so on. Now this Socrates refutes by implication, for since Socrates did not possess that science, how could he teach it? But this is not explicitly stated. It is also not made clear whether to make the weaker speech the stronger one is part of the science and what could rhetoric possibly have to do with, say, astronomy? That seems a very far-fetched question. This much about the first part of his refutation of the whole charge. Now before we have a discussion I suggest that we read the second half, which begins where we left off.

R: "But in fact none of these things are true,...that is not true either."

S: "Teach people" is not good. Let us translate, "educate human beings."

It's more literal.

R: "...that I undertake to educate humans...and taught so reasonably."

S: "Reasonably" meaning at such a reasonable price.

R: "...so cheaply. I myself should be wain...not understand them, men of Athens."

S: Yes. Now that is...Now let us see. The bi-partition of the old charge corresponds to the bi-partition of the present charge. Namely, the present charge, to mention this in advance, if you don't know or remember it, atheism, corruption of the young. And here we have an equivalent to the corruption of the young, namely that Socrates is educating human beings. Educating human beings means... That's a rather low phrase, low expression. It's indicated by the examples, say, horses or cows, you know? There is also a species called men, this non-feathered biped. And just as you need a herdsman there, or here, you need a herdsman there. Now educating human beings for money is also a subject in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, by the way. Now here Socrates says, "Someone might have told the Athenians." He no longer says, "Many might have told them." That Socrates was trying to educate human beings for money. Educating human beings--I add, for money, with a question-mark--too, is a fine thing, Socrates says, like the knowledge or science mentioned before, knowledge of the things aloft. Although it includes making the weaker speech the stronger one. Now this formula, making the weaker speech the stronger one, stems from Protagoras, who also is an expert in educating human beings. But he is not mentioned here, as you see, for the very good reason that Protagoras had been accused of impiety before Socrates, so why should one aggravate the situation unnecessarily? The three men mentioned here--in the center is Prodicus, the man whom Socrates respected most of these people, and with whom he was most closely [allied? or aligned?]. At any rate, these men were sophists, and Socrates says here in so many words that to be a sophist is a fine thing. I mean what Socrates thought about sophistry is a very long question, but here in his most popular speech, in his only Platonic speech which he addresses to the people of Athens, he does not attack the sophists. On the contrary. Sophistry is something fine, I mean sophistry, i.e., educating human beings for money. Now one of the accusers, and the wire-puller behind the accusation altogether, Anytus, occurs in the dialogue *Meno*, and speaks very angrily and viciously about the sophists. And as Socrates finds out very soon, he has never seen a sophist in his life. It's just a vicious prejudice. And compared with such people filled with vicious prejudice, Socrates has a certain reasonable sympathy for the people accused, who cannot defend themselves. But moreover in the *Republic*, in the fifth or sixth book, when the question of sophistry comes up, Socrates says, "The sophist par excellence is the political multitude," and not these individuals who were so unpopular with many Athenians. So that should not be too surprising. Socrates, we see here, casts some doubt on the possibility of men possessing that art, *techné*, not *epistémé*, science, of educating human beings. But he did not cast any doubt on the possibility of men's possessing knowledge of the things aloft. He did not say anything [on this point?/ And you must have observed the obviously comical character of the Callias/Euenus story. From where? Then who? From where? And for how much? That is...I'm sure has not escaped anyone.

Now there is another point in Burnet's commentary on 19c 4, which I would like

to read to you. Where Socrates says..."Socrates was acquainted with the science of his time, and he was dissatisfied with it." Burnet on the basis of his profound knowledge says that. But here he says, "It is to be observed that Socrates could hardly be expected to explain his real ground for dissatisfaction with the science of his time to a popular court." But the question is, did Socrates say anything to the effect that he was dissatisfied here?

A: Yes, he does. He says, "And I say this not to cast dishonor upon such knowledge if anyone is wise about each matters," which seems to imply that perhaps nobody is.

S: So it's a condition.

A: He says, "I don't want to cast doubt upon it if anyone at all is wisest about it," so...nobody is.

S: Yea, this is...Now let us compare it with the parallel when he speaks of the other science. In 20b...c 1, when he speaks of Evenus. "Evenus is to be blessed, if he had truly..." The different conditional clause. Questions it much more. The "if" here is an ordinary conditional clause which does not have this strength of a denial. But it is indeed a condition, you are quite right. But on the other hand, what follows immediately? "May I not be charged of such a charge by merit." Which seems to indicate...And later on when he says, "This, too, seemed to me a fine thing," which implies that the preceding [form] was also a fine thing.

Q: Isn't it possible, though, that the explanation for how he could have studied physiologia in his youth and say now, "I know nothing about it," is that after studying it he decided there was nothing in it? That it was wrong.

S: That could be, but there is no statement to this effect here.

A: Except the slight implication in his question.

S: Slight implication. Less strong than the case of education of human beings. Now at any rate Socrates doesn't say here a word to the effect that he was dissatisfied with "the science of his time." Such a thing like "the science of his time" does not exist in Socrates' language. He denies any knowledge of it. And now here is another point in Burnet, 19c 7. Now what did I do? I'm sorry. I don't find it now. Well the word "science." "Socrates is not to be frightened into expressing a contempt for science which he does not feel." Here the simple question: What is science? For a man living in the 19th century it is clear, he knows what science is--modern science, more or less. But what does science mean? Socrates says, "this kind of science," "this kind of knowledge." We shall come back to this point later. And of course it is quite clear when he speaks of these sophists, or alleged educators of human beings, are these men able to educate human beings or are they merely able to persuade the young to follow them? The latter is undoubtedly true. Because they are somehow exciting, strange birds, the sophists--were exciting than their uncles, grandfathers, and so on. So they succeed. But whether they are able to educate is an open question. Now this is the refutation of the charge. It consists in simple denial, at best--in the first case--in an appeal to the many who do not know what Socrates did outside of the

marketplace, to tell to each other, as it were, that Socrates did not do or know any of these things. Good. This much...So this is the refutation of the first accusers. Now this raises of course a very great difficulty, which I mentioned before, how come that Socrates got such a bad name if he was innocent of this strange doing of the physiologists and/or the sophists? Shall we go on now?

R: "Now perhaps someone might rejoins...the troubles about you?"

S: Or "What is your business", "the business," "your business."

R: "Whence have these slanders against you...and speaking to arouse slander against me."

S: Yes, now let us stop here. What is Socrates' peculiarity which made him hated? What is that business peculiar to him? Now Socrates says the first answer is connected with his wisdom, which is human wisdom, qualified--seems to be human wisdom. Human, not superhuman, like that of Gorgias, Prodicus, and Hippodamas. And this seems to imply because it is superhuman it is impossible for man. And therefore the alleged wisdom of these sophists is a sham. But it is not so clear whether physiologia, whether the study of nature, would be superhuman. Now there is here in c 6-8 a certain...e seeming repetitiousness. But Socrates makes here a distinction. He does something more out of the common, or more superfluous than others, and that he does something different from what the many do. Now the latter is of course much less questionable and undesirable than the first. The emphasis is altogether on what Socrates is doing. The logos, the speech, the name, which he [got?] is about Socrates' doings, his business, his pragma. Now here is another point in Burnet, in 20...on 22d 8. "Human wisdom," in d 8... [Burnet says?] this is of course the keynote of the Socratic teaching." Of course is never quite of course. "It must however be remembered that he does not mean merely, as it is sometime supposed, worldly wisdom. It includes logic, and the theory of knowledge and it includes ethics." Now what do we say to this learned note? And we observe here a fundamental defect of interpretation which shows in another way, in a certain way in another way in Burnet's naivete. Well this distinction of philosophy into disciplines, like logic and ethics, and so on, is post-Platonic. So it is very grave to apply it to Plato, and also to Socrates. "Theory of knowledge" is perhaps stemming from Hegel, but surely not Platonic or Aristotelian. This remark of Burnet, this as well as others, suffers from another defect. He speaks quite frequently of Socrates' irony, and therefore the question is...that has to be considered also in details. Where does irony begin and where does it stop? One cannot fall back on irony in cases where it hits you over the head, like when he describes the situation between Callias and Euthydemus. This is not a vehicle which stops when you give it a sign, like a taxi. One has to put this on a much broader basis. ²This much on this section.

So Socrates regards this request as perfectly just, that he should explain how did he get this bad reputation if he lived and acted like every other normal Athenian citizen. And the explanation he will give in the immediate sequel. And let us first read the immediate sequel.

R: "And, men of Athens, do not interrupt me...is a person of weight."

S: "There is a person"...all right. "Is someone trustworthy to you," let us say.

R: "For of my wisdom--since Chaerephon is dead."

S: Yes. So Socrates proves that he possesses human wisdom by a witness whom the Athenians regard as trustworthy. Who is that witness? The god in Delphi. That is what he says. But how do they know what the god in Delphi said?

A: From Chaerephon. S: Chaerephon is dead. Chaerephon's brother, Well, this is a point which I mention only in passing. Those of you who have the time should read Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, Book II, chapter 3, where the relation between Chaerephon and one of his brothers, perhaps his only brother, is mentioned. They were not on the best of terms. But it may not be the same brother. Pardon?

Q: Would you repeat the reference? S: *Memorabilia*, Book II, chapter 3. Yes. But still...so Chaerephon is of some importance, without any question, because he is the link. And Chaerephon was...Socrates emphasizes the trustworthiness of Chaerephon himself. He was a comrade of Socrates. Comrade is not quite so good, so to speak, as a friend, *philos* in Greek, but still--you know, a man with whom you are in rather regular contact. And he is trustworthy to the Athenians, i.e., to the demos, because he was a rather zealous democrat, [at least to that leads to?] this description. Well "the democratic party" is a free translation; he says "the multitude," but it has indeed this meaning. For even if Apollo were a trustworthy witness, his testimony would have been mediated by Chaerephon. The god in Delphi said that Socrates possesses the highest wisdom that a man can possess. And this implies that Socrates is wiser than the ephiate, whose wisdom, if it exists, is superhuman and therefore impossible, and even than the physiologists. Now here this story about Chaerephon in Delphi is the second story told by Socrates in the *Apology*. The first one was that about Callias and Euenus, which we have read shortly before. Both stories are new to the audience; otherwise they would not have to be told. In contrast, for example, with later--31c 7, ff., when Socrates speaks of his demonic thing. There he says, "Well you have heard me talk about it frequently." So we can assume the audience--or a considerable part of the audience--knows the story of Socrates' *daemonion*. But these two stories are new, at least to the large majority. But this leads to a further question. Is the story of the first accusers not also new to the audience? Socrates had to tell them; it was something which they apparently had never heard before. And what is the evidence for that story? Aristophanes' *Clouds*? The comedy? But was that an accusation? These are dark things. Now the purport of the story of the oracle in the context of the *Apology* as a whole is this: Socrates proves his piety, which as we know is not in need of proof. He proves that in passing, in the sequel. And he proves it abundantly. His whole life is devoted to the service of Apollo, of the god, as he will make clear later. But of course his piety is in need of proof, for the simple reason that the jury has a prejudice that he is not pious. One thing which one can easily overlook: Chaerephon asks the god in Delphi. He went to Delphi. Why did he go there? The wording of the question--"Is there anyone wiser than Socrates?"--shows that Socrates had impressed Chaerephon as wise before Chaerephon went to Delphi. We can therefore say--we are forced to say--there was a pre-Delphic Socratic wisdom. And what Socrates will say about his wisdom in the sequel is a post-Delphic Socratic wisdom. And the only question is where to draw the lines in terms of years. Was this pre-Delphic Socratic wisdom perhaps not something like Socrates' youthful physiology? Did Chaerephon seek Delphic authorization of that pre-Delphic wisdom, or protection for it? These are questions which we must raise, and for which we do not get an answer. Socrates states that Chaerephon's action was daring, was bold. Why was it a bold question? "Is anyone wiser than Socrates?" But of course, measured by Socrates' modesty. In

Greek, apophrosyne, a term which doesn't seem to occur in the Apology, by the way. But also there is another reason why it is daring, corresponding to the ambiguity regarding the trustworthy witness, namely, it is Apollo or is it Chaerephon's brother? He asked, "Is anyone wiser than Socrates?" "Anyone" is so wide that it doesn't decide the difference between men or god. We do not know. Yes. Now this much about this. We must read the immediate sequel and then we'll have a brief discussion. But first we must see Socrates' reaction to the Oracle. He has now heard from Apollo himself, mediated by Chaerephon, that no one is wiser than Socrates. What is his reaction to that extraordinary story? Let us read [the immediate sequel].

R: "But see why I say these things:...for that is not possible for him."

S: No, that is not ; "It is not right for him," "not meet for him."

R: "And for a long time I was at a loss...somewhat as follows."

S: Now let us stop here. Now the Oracle, which Socrates interprets to mean that he is the wisest--whereas the god had only said no one is wiser than he, the Oracle was unintelligible to him, for he was not aware of his possessing any wisdom. But, so then he could simply reject the Oracle as foolish. But this he cannot, because the god does not say the untrue, he does not lie. And he doesn't lie because it is not proper, or meet, for him. As a consequence the Oracle is a riddle. On the face of it it is impossible; yet it must be possible. Socrates must solve the riddle by examining in one way or the other the god or his saying. Now again let us turn to a remark of Burnet, on 21b 6. "Socrates would naturally shrink from the attempt to prove the god a liar, but that is just what he tried to do. He does not seem to fear that the Athenians will regard this as impious. The fact is that the ordinary Athenian had no great respect for the Pythian Apollo, the Apollo of Delphi, because the Oracle had taken the Persian side and the Spartan side and generally opposed the Athenians." I think I'm much too convinced of Socrates' piety to go into this kind of what the average political Athenian thought about the Pythian Apollo; I take this as literally as I possibly can. Socrates knows that he is not wise. The Oracle asserts the opposite. And the first reaction is that the Oracle is not above reason but against reason, because it flatly contradicts what Socrates knows. And therefore the Oracle is to be rejected. Yet Socrates is certain that it is not meet for the god to lie. And therefore the radical change. Now what about this question, "Does the god lie or not?" What does Socrates say about it in other contexts? Does anyone of you remember the Socratic discussion of the veracity of the gods? Yes?

Broken: Not necessarily the veracity, but whether they know what they're talking about. When he's talking to Polus, he says they must have some divine inspiration, they don't know what they're talking about, just like oracles and prophets.

S: But the oracles...Well of course this could conceivably mean the Pythia, as distinguished from the god. No, that is not the point. Yes?

A: In the Republic he says the gods have traditionally been understood as liars, but in the best City they will be understood as truth-tellers.

S: Yes, that's the passage which he meant, in the second book of the

Republic. There are two dogmas of what is called there the theology, and the second dogma is the veracity of the gods. The passages are 380d - 382e. One would have to read the whole passage. The gods do not lie; that is said here. But it is made clear, very clear, why they do not have to lie. For human beings it is sometimes met to lie. For example, parents to children. The simple story of the stork, which was formerly given as the other form of sexual enlightenment, I believe it is called now, and which is such a lie--that is proper. And there are also lies of a somewhat more interesting kind, lies used by generals toward demoralized soldiers, or soldiers in danger of becoming demoralized, of rulers toward their unwise subjects, and so on. In brief--and I ask you to check what I assert now--the grave premise of this discussion in the Republic is that the gods do not rule human beings, and in particular human beings of questionable morality; that is the implication of the assertion of divine veracity. The discussion of this subject is by no means limited to Plato's Republic. It is taken up again in modern times especially by Descartes in his Meditation, where the veracity of God is a key dogma, so to speak, for overcoming the fundamental skepticism. And in the objections made by Pere Mersenne (will you write his name on the blackboard? If you make a mistake correct it.), this Mersenne, a theologian, questioned the correctness that...of Descartes' assertion that God--not Apollo but the Biblical God--does not say the untruth. For example, that one example which he gives, Nineveh will be destroyed in forty days, in the book of Jonah, and it is not destroyed, it is not destroyed in forty days. So God has said the untruth. Well, of course, as a threat. But still, if you take the assertion literally, it was an assertion literally untrue. And Descartes gives no answer to that. You might... if you have the time you might read it. Even granted without qualification that it is not met for a god to lie, this implies of course that it is met for a man to lie in certain circumstances. This is not questioned by Socrates here or elsewhere. The interesting question is this: Are the present circumstances of Socrates of this character, that it might be met to say the untruth, a partial untruth to the people? I reminded you before, last time, of Socrates' description in the Gorgias of the situation in which he would find himself if accused, the situation of the candy-maker accused...I'm sorry, of the physician accused by the candy-maker that he inflicts pain on the children, and the children of course condemn him and take the side of the candy-maker. Now if it is met to lie for Socrates in such circumstances, it is of course also met for him to assert that he does not lie, that he says the truth and nothing but the truth, and this is what he does all the time. Is this not clear? If it is right to lie under certain conditions, it is also right to assert that one does not lie while one lies. It is an unpleasant point to make but I think a necessary point. Now what he does next is that Socrates describes his examination of the Oracle. And this examination proves to be a vindication of the Oracle. And even more than that, it proves that his whole life was a constant service to Apollo, to the god, namely, by proving that how wise he was by saying that no one was wiser than Socrates. We will take this up when we come, but here let us stop here for a moment at this point, and see whether there are not any questions. Yes.

Q: When Socrates is telling the Athenians that Charephon was their comrade, was the comrade of his youth and their comrade--"the comrade of your democratic party," he says...

S: "Of the multitude." But these things can be dated. "Your flight," or "your exile," that was in 403 or thereabouts. When the oligarchic party had won

and the return after the defeat, 404 or 403. at this time, so that was about four years, four or five years before the speech is supposed to have been delivered. Yes.

Q: I missed a little bit of what you said there.

S: No because you referred to the youth of Socrates. But Chaerephon was surely a comrade of the Athenian demos while Socrates was an old man already.

Q: Is that "your democratic party" that he's mentioning here...

S: He doesn't say "your democratic party;" he says "the multitude." But that means in fact the demos, and in this sense if you can use such a word as party in a classic Greek context you can say "your democratic party."

Q: What I was trying to understand is whether Socrates was here setting himself apart as a non-democrat.

S: That he makes quite clear: I think so. We found an earlier passage to this effect. But the mere fact that he makes a distinction between being a comrade of Socrates and a comrade of the demos at least indicated... But I believe last time we had already seen a passage, although I do not remember at the moment, which intimated this cleavage between Socrates and the demos. No this could hardly be... No, it will come up in the sequel I think. It will come out in the sequel. Socrates does not pretend anywhere that he was a card-carrying member of the democratic party of Athens.

Q: But it is a curious thing that he would bring this up while he is accused ...

S: Because this was the most obvious point. That has misled quite a few modern interpreters a generation ago. They couldn't believe that impiety could possibly be the ground of the charge against Socrates. Partly because Socrates is notoriously pious and partly because Athens is notoriously liberal, tolerant. But that was so. And so they had to find a reason, and they said "Of course, Socrates was not a democrat." And in Xenophon's presentation, the second chapter of the Memorabilia, when he gives the first quotation from the accuser's speech—whatever that accuser may have been—the first quotation refers to Socrates' criticism of democracy, namely, that it is an absurd regime because people are elected or picked for offices on the basis of the lot. You know? Meaning, in a wholly random manner. Which is not quite literally true. You know there were some people, some offices to which people were elected by raising the hands. But quite a few to which people were elected just by lot. And that is of course the most democratic form, you know, perfect equality among the citizens. No one has ever said that Socrates was a democrat. That is clear. But whether this was the reason why he became unpopular and ultimately why he was accused, condemned and executed, that is a long question. There is some evidence for this view in the very text of the Apology, as we will see soon. There is no doubt. Was this the point you wanted to make?

A: Yes. S: And by the way let us never forget one thing. We see in classical antiquity quite a few people who were anti-democratic. The most extreme anti-democratic statement ever written in classical antiquity, and perhaps also in modern times, occurs in a Platonic writing, in the Republic where Socrates is presented as

setting forth his anti-democratic view. So one could understand that people who were democrats, in the ancient sense of the term, hated Socrates on that score. That would be intelligible. But it is not, as Plato's diagnosis is, that was not the core of the matter. The core, as we shall see, was the impiety charge. Whether there is a connection between the impiety charge and the non-democrat charge, that is a long question. We are not yet prepared to discuss it. Now you raised your hand.

Fielding: Mr. Strauss, I believe you said that the first accusers are utterly untrustworthy, and I wonder what you mean by that, if Socrates did study nature as you...

S: Well you see, there is...Socrates says if one wants to take up the issue with them, that is a kind of fighting with...shadow boxing. That is true on more than one level. Who are they? What is the source of their knowledge? They are unknown...There are so many, and yet they are unknown. So you can't ask them, can't cross-examine them. And therefore you can't ask them, "How can you say such a thing of me, that I am studying the things beneath the earth?" Because you don't know whom to ask.

Fielding: But that still doesn't mean that the charge literally is not true. S: It does not...? F: It doesn't mean that Socrates did not at one time study these things...

S: That is exactly the point. That is the point. We will see later the only attempt at refutation which carries some weight--of direct refutation--is the discussion of the present accuser, known by name, Meletus, whom Socrates cross-examines...And then he proves to Meletus beautifully that Meletus contradicts himself by saying that Socrates doesn't...He says in the discussion, not in the text of the charge, that Socrates doesn't believe in the gods. But then he says that Socrates introduces new divinities. Now if he introduces new divinities, then of course he is not an atheist. That's simple. But before we can handle that properly we have to know first, did Socrates quote the charge literally, or did he manipulate it? The question which we cannot take up until we have reached that point. Maybe Meletus was not such an extreme fool as he appears from The Apology.

Q: If the first accusers are unknown, how does Socrates have knowledge of the first charges, the original charges against him?

S: Well, one thing we know, that is Aristophanes' Clouds. But Socrates presents it that Aristophanes' Clouds was only one quite obvious sign of the existence of first accusers, if you please, a kind of parody perhaps, but that is of course no proof that there were such first accusers. Socrates does not give any proof of the existence of first accusers. He merely tells the Athenians this point--which the Athenians have to be told, because they do not know it--that there were first accusers.

Q: Where does he have knowledge of the accusations, outside of the Clouds?

S: Who knows? So in other words that is a kind of...You can say that is a piece of rhetoric. I mean if someone says there were such first accusers, apart from Aristophanes or other comic poets, then the burden or proof would rest on

him. It seems that Socrates' unpopularity came out rather late. I mean not with certain individuals whom he may have heard; doubtless this has happened. But that it became a politically relevant thing, that seems to be rather late, shortly before he was accused by the present accusers. Yes?

Q: Do we have another source besides The Apology for the Delphic Oracle story that is not Platonic?

S: Xenophon's formulation, which comes much closer to the original, as someone knowing Plato and Xenophon would expect. Xenophon doesn't take such liberties as Plato does. And above all the text is preserved in Diogenes Laertius, and who has apparently copied it from something like the Athenian archives. But this is a very wonderful piece of good luck we have. But we could prove it that the Socratic formulation here is not literal by the fact that Socrates says, "about," "the charge is roughly like this," or something of this kind. But there is no question that this is not literal.

Q: But the Delphic story, the story of the...

S: No evidence. No evidence.

Q: This is the only...

S: Yes. Sure. But there is...You see the point?...this question, what I call now a pre-Delphic Socrates and a post-Delphic Socrates. Or one can also say the young Socrates, as distinguished from the mature and old Socrates, a distinction which I believe today would be generally accepted. There is a parallel to that in Xenophon's Memorabilia, chapter 11. And there Socrates meets the prototype of the Athenian gentleman, a man called Isomachos, who is a landowner, a gentleman farmer, but of some special kind--a very funny kind. And Socrates contrasts his way of life with that of Isomachos. Socrates of course not the gentleman farmer, although he knows everything one has to know about farming simply by having observed farmers by passing by when they were sowing or harvesting

--that was a [simple?] art, the art of farming. And he contrasts that. And Socrates speaks here of himself as a man who is said to walk on the air and do the other things which were said by the comic poets. Now this conversation is made with Isomachos, because Socrates wants to find out what is the perfect gentleman--which is the same question as, what is virtue? Socrates here also...he has never given any thought to what is a perfect gentleman before, but he had already required reputation or notoriety for being a natural philosopher. So that is Xenophon's way of stating that there...some conversion had taken place in Socrates' life. This I think we can regard as certain, historically certain, and this is somehow also here presupposed. Yes?

Q: Immediately after Socrates appeals from the prejudice of the many to the knowledge of the many, he says that "From this you may know that the other things which the many say about me are similar."

S: Where is that?

Q: 19d. Just before the end of the first paragraph, in the refutation.

S: "The other things," namely...I suppose one can say this refers to making

the weak speech...weaker speech stronger. Yes? And perhaps also that he teaches physiology, and not merely studies it.

Q: It couldn't refer to the age of the many as witnesses, because in the previous sentence the many just said something.

S: There is a subtle distinction which comes out only in the original. When he says "other things which the many say about me," and then formerly, for example, in d 3 he had said "many of you," which is not quite the same as "the many," which needs some discussion of their relation. "The many," meaning the Athenian multitude; "many of you" means many of--say, a large part of the citizen body, not necessarily the majority.

Q: That's not simply true, because a few lines previously he had said that "I will supply the many of you as witnesses," and he uses that strictly parallel with "many."

S: Sure, in d 1, yes. That is true. But "the many of you" is not quite... I mean that is not quite the same as "the many." Because "the many" might also include, for example, Metics, women--for all I know--you know? And "many of you"--that would be many of the full citizens who are members of the jury. There is a certain ambiguity regarding the many quite naturally, because that is connected with the fundamental distinction made earlier between the many...between many who have heard him talk, in the market place, and (and this is my interpretation) a few who have heard him elsewhere. And where to draw the line? This is another indication of the riddle here, this usage to which you refer. Yes?

Q: You mentioned that in Chaerephon's question, he did not differentiate between the gods and men when he says "Is anyone wiser than Socrates?" In 20d, Socrates is leading up to the narration, he makes a reference to "the only wisdom that man can have." S: Now which is that? Q: In 20d. S: Yes, that is right. Q: What kind of wisdom, the only wisdom that man can have?

S: Sure. The other would be a super-human wisdom which the sophists have. Yes?

Q: Well, later when he talks about finding out what kind of wisdom he has, it was the wisdom of his own...limited wisdom, Socrates' wisdom was wisdom that didn't know about such things, presumably the god's wisdom would be unlimited.

S: You can adduce plenty of evidence from other Platonic dialogues to this effect; that is easy. But the question is, what does it mean in this context? And what does it mean especially in the mouth of Chaerephon?

Q: I was wondering, is Socrates deliberately separating himself from Chaerephon by having Chaerephon not differentiate between...?

S: It could also be some joke at the expense of the Delphic prophesess, that she answered such an ill defined question so simply to the detriment of her own high patron. That could also be. Socrates' belief in the gods is not the same as believing in the gods in which the average Athenian believed, you know? So he

could very well have the notion that these gods--say, as presented by Homer and as underlying the common Athenian cultic practice--are indeed very, not very respectable beings, and as a matter of fact, not beings at all. That would be perfectly compatible with his believing in gods in a different way.

Now shall we... We have the time to read the first stage of Socrates' examination of the Oracle, unless there are some questions. If not, Mr. Reinken will ...21b 9.

R: "I went to one of those who had a reputation for wisdom,...prove the utterance wrong..."

S: "The utterance" meaning the Oracle, to make quite clear. "Here if anywhere I could refute the Oracle." That's very important. Yes?

R: "...and should show the oracle,...both to him and to many others."

S: Yes. Now this was the first stage. He translates the Greek word politikoi by "public men." Let us rather say "the political men," to make it quite clear, if not politicians...using the word politicians in its neutral sense, because a politician does not have to be a wicked man of course. Now Socrates clearly sets out to refute the Oracles, which means to act on the belief that the god does lie, or is not wise--meaning, says the untruth because he doesn't know better. He examines first the political men, who believed to know something but in fact did not, and hence proved to be less wise than Socrates. So in this way Socrates makes a nuisance of himself. These others of whom he speaks toward the end of the passage, whom Socrates examined in addition to the first men mentioned, are presumably also political men--presumably, but not necessarily. They might be a kind of man akin to the public men. Now in d 3-4, "No man knows anything fine and good," "noble and good." Now this is of course a very grave assertion. No man knows anything noble and good. This is qualified by "it seems to be," doklein men [?]. If taken without the qualification it leads to the unqualified dependence on oracles and the like for knowledge of noble and good things. If we know nothing of that by ourselves, what shall we do? Yet will this dependence on oracles and so on be of any help? That would be the question.

At the beginning when he comes to speak of this political man whose name he knows but does not wish to mention because, after all, it is unmanly, would be unmanly to do so, he says "conversing with him," dialogomenos. And he makes here a distinction before--diaskopon, considering him, looking at him, looking through him, before he converses with him. In other words, Socrates knew before that he was an empty-headed pompous ass. [laughter] But he has seen before through him, but why does he then converse with him in addition to that? I believe we can see a reason. He did it in order to show those present that the fellow was despicable. They would not necessarily have Socrates' faculty quickly to see through a man.

Now it is important to observe the differences between Socrates' examination of the political man--political man--and those of the others. We shall make some observation regarding them when we come to these passages. One point I would like to mention only now, that he speaks of conversing in the strict sense--dialogas-
hai, from which the word "dialogue" is derived--only when he speaks of the

political man, and not of the other ones. Somehow, from a certain point of view, which will become clear I think, the political man and Socrates' debunking of them is the thing which did him much more harm than his examination of the poets and of the handicraftsmen of whom he will speak in the sequel. Yes? And this would of course confirm the view, which is up to a certain point quite correct, that these politicians were presumably democratic politicians, and therefore by debunking them the democratic populace came to detest Socrates, and some aggravating circumstances which we shall see later. Someone raised his...Yes.

Q: Socrates doesn't really believe that no man knows anything fine and good; doesn't he really say that, given the present conditions that we perceive things through our senses, we can only get an idea of what is absolutely good and beautiful and true, but if we didn't have this idea of what is absolutely good or beautiful or true, how would we ever know to look for it?

S: Yes. Now what is the precise version, in d 3...?

Q: He says "for neither of us really knows..."

S: The word which he uses here, know, eidemi, is a looser word, not epistesthai. And that means "we do not have any knowledge," in the widest sense of knowledge, of anything noble and good. This is of course impossible, as you say. Surely. But Socrates exaggerates his ignorance, clearly. Why does he do it? That is exactly his irony in the strict sense. I mean not in the sense in which we ordinarily use the word irony. Namely, irony means--I believe I said this before but I'll repeat it--irony means to understate one's own worth. You know? To present oneself as less virtuous than one is. And therefore in particular it means to present oneself as less wise than one is. And one will do this on the superficial, by practically important level, in order not to hurt people's feelings. People wouldn't like it if Socrates would appear to be wiser than they. And whatever he can do by his examining people and being the humble, ignorant Socrates, who shows, however...shows up these sages as still unwiser than he is, he comes to be regarded as wise by those present, i.e., the adherents of these empty-headed fellows, and then he becomes hated on this score. So Socrates can't escape hatred, except if he would bury himself in some corner and only see his milk-man, so to say, delivering the milk. Yes?

R: What may be ... ultimately lead to the matching of impiety to the democracy charge. You've just shown in this section that Socrates treats gods and man alike. He says, "I was being pious, I was considering well what Apollo wanted," but really he tried to show Apollo up. He said "I don't name the politician," which is making an obvious show of his respect for the state's good name, but in fact he was at pains to make the man a fool before his friends. So on the surface...

S: I do not quite see the parallel.

R: On the surface, he says "I am pious and respectful to gods and to political man," the example being, "I don't name names." But in each case he tries to show them up.

S: But with this difference, because in the case of Apollo, he vindicates Apollo, whereas in the case of the politician he debunks him. I mean if there is a parallel it is more complicated than that. Good. So we have now...If you have any further questions, as I hope you have, write them down and we will discuss...

I suppose you have many questions, and partly this may be my doing because I encouraged you, but on the other hand we must proceed at a somewhat faster pace. And therefore I suggest that we discuss today first the whole section with which we are now concerned, and have a discussion afterward.

But I remind again of the context. Socrates was accused by the first accusers of studying the things aloft, etc., and of attempting to educate human beings for money. Now this bi-partition is identical, we can say, foreshadowed, or reflects, the bi-partition of the actual indictment. He flatly denies that he did these things, while indicating that in themselves they are fine things, noble things. To substantiate this denial he appeals to many of the judges as witnesses, namely to the many who know of Socrates' doings only through hearsay, or at best through what they heard Socrates say on the marketplace. At any rate Socrates contends that the charge of the persecutors was altogether baseless. Why then did he become the target of slander or persecution? What is Socrates' peculiar pragma, his peculiar business? It is Socrates' reaction or response to a Delphic Oracle, he says. It is Socrates' post-Delphic business. Which leaves one wondering what was his pre-Delphic business. The Delphic Oracle was enigmatic and incredible. No one is wiser than Socrates. Which Socrates takes to mean, Socrates is most wise, not to say the wisest. Socrates tries to refute the Oracle. This attempt is based on the assumption that the god might say the untruth. The god doesn't lie—pseudetai in Greek. This is in Greek ambiguous. Lying means also unconsciously lying, so the proper translation would be "saying a falsehood." That the god might say the untruth either consciously or unconsciously. Now in the latter case the god clearly would not be wise, if he is mistaken in such an important point. And this would be in accordance with Chaerophon's question, addressed to the god, which literally taken means, "Is anybody wiser than Socrates, man or god?" But the great event, a miracle which happened, Socrates' attempt to refute the Oracle, turns into a vindication of the Oracle.

Now Socrates tries to refute the Oracle by discovering men who were wiser than Socrates. And first he goes to the political men. By debunking them, Socrates became hated by them—naturally—and those present. Those present must have been admirers or followers of the political men; otherwise they would have been amused by Socrates' doings rather than hating him. Socrates conversed with the political men, had dialogues with them. This term does not occur when he speaks of the two other kind of people, to whom we will turn now. And this in itself would create this impression, that Socrates' dialogues are exclusively or chiefly dialogues with political men, in contradistinction to the two other groups. We will take this up very soon. Now I ask now Mr. Reinken to read 21e 3, ff.

R: "After this then I went on...proved to be irrefutable."

S: Now let us stop here. By the way, "Herculean" is not here; that is an addition of the translator. Now this is the introduction to the central part of the examination, and the central stage which is devoted to the poets. The examination of the Oracle and of the political men—because he examines actually also the Oracle while doing it—has a three-fold effect on Socrates, as appears here in the beginning. He becomes aware that he is hated, he is pained by this fact, and he is filled with fear because of it. In the center is, he becomes pained, which means Socrates would wish to be pleased by refuting the Oracle. By refuting

the Oracle he would prove to be like the others, like everybody. He would be liked by his fellow citizens. And who would not wish to be liked by his fellow citizens? Yet he goes on in spite of this bad experience; why? The vindication of the Oracle, he says now, is much more important than his well being. The vindication of the Oracle, or the understanding of the Oracle. That is the same thing. Namely, the understanding of it as a true statement is of course a vindication. Or one can also say obedience to the Oracle, as it comes out.

Now between these remarks when he speaks of the vindication and finally the obedience, there occurs this strange oath, "by the Dog." This oath was also used by other people. But of course in the mouth of Socrates it has a Socratic meaning. And the question is, what is that Socratic meaning? I cannot answer that question; it would take much too long. But I can only say one cannot answer it without raising the question, what do dogs mean for Socrates? Do we have any evidence for that? Yes!

A: In the Republic the military men are compared to dogs.

S: Yes, and also other people. The dog is called the philosophic animal. That is of course only a restatement of the riddle. But we cannot go beyond that now. Yes!

A: I was just going to mention something....that young philosophers are compared to dogs.

S: That's also true...to puppies, rather. To puppies. The crucial change from the desire to refute the Oracle to obedience to the Oracle, this crucial change we may call Socrates' conversion. Before he was a skeptic, we can say, and after it he was convinced. Perhaps it was a conversion from his youthful physiologie to his later political philosophy. Now the result of his further examination of the Oracle, or of the Athenians in contradistinction to his examination of politicians only, the lowly are superior in regard to being sensible, it is said here. Now being sensible is surely something noble and good. And Socrates knows that this is noble and good, to be sensible, to be superior in sensibility. Now how is this compatible with his knowledge of ignorance? That he knows that sensibility is good? There is a difficulty here. Or differently stated, to know that something is disgraceful and bad means of course also to know something good and fine, otherwise you couldn't recognise it as disgraceful and bad. Now let us take the position now prevailing in social science. They also say, "We have no knowledge of anything noble and good, no knowledge of values." But they add they also have no knowledge of anything base or bad. And to that extent they are more consistent. How does Socrates overcome this difficulty? Well roughly like this: Men raise claims all the time, that is to say, they assert that they deserve something good, be it only a good name. That they deserve something good not merely by virtue of their raising the claim; that would be too simple. Their claim must be measured by the standard implied in the claim! Surely that must be done. If someone says he is a great general, all right, let us see whether he is a great general. But then of course the standard itself must be examined. Perhaps the experience with the use of the standard, with the application of the standard, prepares us for the examination of the standard itself. That might be possible. The result here in Socrates is, modesty is more sensible than boasting. A very limited result but by no means negligible, because we see from time to time quite a few boasters, and then we wonder how [they?] do not become aware of it.

Now is this result open to doubt, or is this also just an irrational value judgment? I think that one can prove that it is a sensible statement, because the ridiculous character of the boasting--if the boasting is discovered, of course--contradicts the primary aim of the boaster. He wants to be looked up to. And when he is debunked he is despised. So boasting is surely more irrational than being modest, generally speaking. Now let us now come to the examination of the poets.

R: "For after the public man I went...in which I excelled the public men."

S: There is one point. When he says "not by wisdom, but by nature"--"by some nature," "by some nature." A loose modern equivalent would be "by some instinct," but let us leave it at the translation "by some nature." So Socrates approaches the poets in the hope there clearly to refute the Oracle, because the poets were famous for their wisdom. He does not mention explicitly the comic poets, as you have seen. The poets are most obviously wise; they have great excellences. Socrates did not speak of the excellences of the political man, as you will have seen. So that Socrates shows bare by silence a high regard for the poets, never forget that. Yet the poets do not possess wisdom, that is to say, knowledge. They do what they do by virtue of some nature, like the seers, for the latter, like the poets, say many fine things without knowing it. But the poets are misled by their great achievements into believing that they are wise in other things, too. You must also have observed that Socrates says nothing to the effect that he became hated by the poets, as he became hated by the political men. Nor does he say that he tried to convince the poets of their lack of knowledge. There is no dialogue, no dialogesthai with them. Socrates implies in a 5-6 that the poets have some wisdom, but he is silent on the rank of that wisdom. He says nothing of his examination of the seers. Socrates says that the seers and poets "say many fine things;" he does not say, as he does in the Meno at the end, that the seers and the poets say many true things. Something fine is not necessarily true. There is a point which Burnet makes on 22b 7. Now let me see. "Those present, the company present when Socrates made the experiment, not those present in the court." That seems to be quite obvious that he means that. But I think it is more important to note that Socrates apparently did not examine the poets in the marketplace, whereas he might very well have examined the political men in the marketplace. In the case of the political man he says there were many around; here he doesn't say there were many around. This is all I have to say now about this passage. And now let us come to the third stage.

R: "Finally then I went to the hand-workers....the good artisans also..."

S: No, that is wrongly translated. "In this they seem to me suffer from the same fault like the poets and the good artisans." So the handicraftsmen are not the artisans. I'll come to that later. Yes?

R: "...also seem to me to have the same failing...for me to be as I am,"

S: Now this handicraftsmen, the third stage, and last stage, from this it follows that the poets are the central stage. Now I give...I'll ask now a dogmatic assertion, and you don't have to believe it of me, of course, that regle generale, general rule: Whenever Plato makes an enumeration the central item is the most important. That is an experience of many years, and I have nowhere

found this stated through Plato. I have read something in ancient authors why this is so, but this would...I will postpone that. The poets are in a way the peak. Most important does not mean most important absolutely; it may mean most important in the present context. So one has to use one's head. Socrates knew of the handicraftsmen in advance, that they truly knew. The word used, epistamai [17], from which episteme, science, is derived. I translate it now, that they "truly know many fine things." No such knowledge, true knowledge, was said in the case of the politicians and the poets. To that extent there is an order of ascent. The lowest of the low are the politicians, then the poets, and then the shoemakers and other simple craftsmen. This is not too surprising; Republic X --the maker of the bed, the carpenter, is higher than the painter or poet. Good. Yet otherwise these handicraftsmen prove to suffer from the same defect as the two preceding kinds of men. They claim to be wise in the greatest things, regarding the greatest things. Which implies, quite a few men do know some fine and good things. They possess generally knowledge of that, but the only ultimately interesting question is, to have knowledge of the greatest things, of the most comprehensive things. Not all men are ignorant, but all men are ignorant regarding the greatest things. And this affects indeed their knowledge of the many fine things they know, because they are ultimately unable to give an account of what they are doing. Simple case, a shoemaker: he can answer every question you put to him why he uses this kind of leather or that, why he makes this shoe rather than that, but when it comes to the question, what is his whole art for? Protection of feet. What has something to do with health. This has ultimately to do with preservation of life. And the question arises, is life preferable to death? The shoemaker is of course not competent as shoemaker, unless he is a wise man. These handicraftsmen execute their art finally--for example, making shoes. I repeat, in the case of the handicraftsmen as well as in that of the poets, there's no mention of dialogue, conversation, or of the presence of many at the examination, and of the examination leading to hatred of Socrates. I infer that what made Socrates hated was above all his public examination in the marketplace of the politicians, perhaps especially of the democratic politicians. And this would make as wonder, were those politicians and their followers not the first accusers par excellence?

Now since we are through now with the examination, we have to raise the question, what kind of people were not examined by Socrates? Well, those he doesn't mention. The mere laborers, the completely unskilled workers. The peasants, cultivators of the soil, the traitors--the traders, I'm sorry, as well as the man who were merely doing their own business, i.e., all men whom no one, including themselves, would regard as wise. There no examination was needed. Now this expression, "the good craftsmen," hagatoi demiourgoi in d 6, this is obviously something different from the handicraftsmen. Well, what could that be? Such people like physicians, sculptors, orators--they are not handicraftsmen, and yet they are demiourgoi, craftsmen of a sort. But why does he emphasize the good? He makes no such distinction in the case of the political men--they are all rotten--or of the poets--they are all inspired. So the distinction between good and bad doesn't arise for different reasons. Does he mean the decent orators? Well that there could be decent orators is indicated by Socrates at the very beginning, at the end of the proemium when he speaks of the duty of the orator, of a man in his position now, to say the truth. And therefore there could be--since Socrates is a speaker here--there could be a good speaker. However this may be, there is one more general conclusion of great importance. When we compare this presentation that the Platonic Socrates gives of his own doings with that given by Plato in the rest of

his work, we make this strange observation: There are hardly any Socratic dialogues with politicians, poets, and handicraftsmen. Here we get the impression that Socrates is a kind of Uncle Sam, pointing his finger at each of you and saying, buttonholing you, "Did you examine yourself today? Did you raise a question about virtue today?" Now this doesn't happen anywhere. There is no dialogue with poets, except at the end of the *Banquet* where it is only referred to in general ways. There is no discussion with craftsmen--with handicraftsmen--and there are very few conversations with actual politicians. Very few. With young men who want to go into politics, quite a few; but not with actual politicians. So that is a fact of some importance for the understanding of the popular presentation of the self-presentation of Socrates when he was accused, compared with Socrates' actual life as Plato presented it. Good.

Now in the sequel, up to 24b 2, Socrates speaks of the total result of his vindication of the Oracle--or what is the same thing, of his examination of the Athenians. And this total result is bi-partite, like the charge and like the accusers. Now let us first read the first part of the total result. 22e 6, ff.

R: "Now from this investigation, men of Athens,...but am in vast poverty on account of my service to the god."

S: "In ten thousand-fold poverty."

R: "And in addition to these..."

S: No, let us stop here. Now you see Socrates in this summary blurs the distinction between his examination of the politicians on the one hand, and his examination of the poets and the handicraftsmen on the other. By this he minimizes the political issue to which he alluded already before, in 21a 1, as you may recall, when he spoke of the difference between being a companion of Socrates and being a companion of the multitude of the Athenians. So Socrates became hated as a wise man, meaning, as superior to all in wisdom. And that hate has a more specific character, as we can know; namely, it is envy, it is envy. But Socrates repeats, he is not wise--only the god is wise, we can say--but this is not what he says here. The god seems to be truly wise by suggesting through his Oracle that human wisdom is of little or no worth, and that it is in the best case like the wisdom of Socrates, knowledge of one's ignorance. So still, while it is of hardly any worth, it is more than most people have, and therefore some envy would be understandable.

Now although all this was settled some time ago, Socrates continued his examination of everyone whom he believed to be wise--that is to say, not of every Athenian. Both citizens and foreigners come now in, like the sophists. He intimates that in some cases the men examined were truly wise. In those cases he in fact refuted the Oracle. By continuing his examination he continued to come to the assistance of the god, whose assistance he identifies with service to the god, or worship of the god, the god of courses being in all cases Apollo. For, one can rightly say, why does the god demand worship if he does not need it? This argument is presented in the dialogue *Euthyphro*. Through his serving the god, Socrates became generally hated, and in addition he became unable to take care of the affairs of the city and of his domestic affairs, so that he lives in ten thousand-fold poverty, in a very rich poverty--ten thousand-fold. Socrates' attempt to refute the

god turned into service of the god, into divine mission. This is the most powerful refutation of the charge of atheism. It precedes his explicit discussion of that charge, for as we shall see soon, Socrates' examination of the Athenians did not by itself give rise to the charge of atheism or to any charge. And that we turn now to the second part of the total result, and read first where we left off.

R: "And in addition to these things,...the sons of the richest men,..."

S: You see the contrast, the poorest Socrates and the richest young men. Yes?

R: "...accompany me of their own accord,...and say that 'Socrates is a...'"

S: No, "There is some Socrates..."

R: "There is a Socrates, a most abominable...For they would not, I fancy, ..."

S: No, let us stop here. So now the first factor was Socrates' examination of the Athenians. The second, and this decisive factor, is Socrates' young followers. They belong to the wealthiest part of the Athenians, i.e., not to the demoi, and they derive amusement from Socrates' debunking these pompous essays. We can say they derive amusement from Socrates' gravely and solemnly serving the god. They don't put it quite in this way. Socrates' reaction was different. He was not amused, but in a way gladdened by his vindication of the Oracle, which is something very different. Not funny. He was not amused by the contrast between the claim and the fact. Now these young men imitate Socrates successfully in examining the Athenians. The examined people become angry at Socrates, and not at these young men who ridicule them in public, and say that Socrates corrupts the young. This is the first time that this part of the charge is explicitly mentioned. In the first mentioning, especially in 18b-c, there is nothing said of corruption of the young. That comes in only here. This part of the actual charge comes first, but the first reaction of these people is, "Socrates corrupts the young." It arises as the immediate consequence of what the young people are doing. But when someone asks the accusers, "By doing what, by teaching what, does Socrates corrupt the young?" they have no answer. And in their embarrassment they say of Socrates what is ready to hand on all philosophizing men--"He doesn't believe in gods," and so on. You see here in the enumeration we have here, not believing in gods is in the center. It is now for the first time a part of the charge. Formerly it was only an inference of the listeners, you remember? Here it is now a part of the charge. And in addition, as I said, central. The same people, then, accuse Socrates of studying the things aloft, etc., and of atheism. Originally he had said that the atheism charge was an inference of those who listened to the first accusers, and that implied that the first accusers were more educated or more sophisticated, or perhaps closer to Socrates than the mere listeners. Now we learn that the first accusers themselves accused Socrates of atheism, that is to say, that they were not superior but rather inferior to the listeners. The first accusers were especially the individuals debunked by Socrates' young, very wealthy, fun-seeking followers. The first accusers were pompous essays: that is implied in that. The atheism charge is traced to the first accusers after they have been thoroughly debunked. The debunking of the first accusers proceeds in an equal step, pari passu, with debunking of the atheism charge. One great difficulty remains. The examination of the Athenians took place after the Oracle. What did Socrates do prior to the Oracle?

I repeat this question. And this question is of course not answered in the Apology. There is a parallel case in the beginning of the Republic, regarding old Cephalus; some of you have made his acquaintance. He is asked...he makes clear the advantage he derives from his great wealth when he is very old and expects to die soon. He forces us to raise the question, what advantage did he derive from his great wealth when he was young, or of middle age? We also don't get an answer. So this procedure of Plato here is not unique. The young men, he said, acted spontaneously. What Socrates did seemed to be so attractive to them, so they spontaneously imitated. Socrates did not act spontaneously; Socrates acted by the prompting or the challenge of the Oracle. Good. Now let us turn to the rest of this passage.

R: "For they would not, I fancy,...you will find that it is so."

S: Thank you. Now this is the end of the discussion regarding the first accusers. We can perhaps state this as follows: That Socrates did these unpopular things, namely, investigating the things aloft, and so on, is of course a lie, a slander. The assertion that he did this is a substitute for another unpopular [truth?], namely, that no one is wise. The latter truth is unpopular because of the love of honor, the ambition, of the many men concerned. They don't wish to...I mean their boasting implies, their self-assurance implies that they are wise in the most important things, in the affairs of the polis, how to conduct domestic and foreign affairs. These many men are impetuous, and speak vigorously and persuasively about Socrates. Thus they have succeeded since a long time in filling Socrates' judges with a strong prejudice against him. The first men...the first accusers are then those successfully debunked by Socrates' young followers. That comes out now. But why not also those debunked by Socrates himself, one can rightly say? In that case, there is an answer to that. If they were the men debunked by Socrates himself, then Socrates would know the names of them, and he says, "I don't know the names of the first accusers." This is clearly contradicted, I admit that, by Socrates' saying in the passage on the examination of the politicians, the first ones, "It's not necessary to mention his name." So he wouldn't say that if he did not know the name. This is a minor but not uninteresting contradiction. "From among," that I think we must translate differently. How did he say in e 3f? R: "From among them." S: "From among the first accusers are the three present accusers." That is to say, there is no difference between the first and second accusers. Anytus is here in the center, rightly, because he was the most powerful of the enemies of Socrates. He attacks Socrates on behalf of the craftsmen and the politicians. He was a tanner, an ill-smelling profession, and therefore an object of ridicule on the part of the comic poets. But Lycon, who had not been mentioned before, is said to attack Socrates on behalf of the crators. Why does Socrates make here a distinction between the political men and the crators? I see only one reason. He denies to Anytus the title of an orator. What reason he had for that I do not know, because we do not know sufficiently of Anytus. But this I think is necessary. The distinction between crators and politicians shows us that the tri-partition used in Socrates' account of his examination is incomplete. There can be no doubt. He indicated that already before when he said he examined anyone who seemed to him to be wise--Athenian or stranger. So there may have been some wise men in the other kinds of men whom Socrates examined.

Now there are a few points in Bernet's commentary which I think we should

briefly mention in 23e 3. This is the passage where we said "of these are Meletus," and so on. And he says on the strength of this, "Socrates means that his present accusers are taking advantage of the old slander." And he refers then to 19b 1, where Socrates says, "My slander, in which Meletus trusted when he wrote the present indictment." Well, Burnet assumes--and he is not the only one to assume that--that there is no progress in Socrates' speech, no shifting of the perspective or of the ground. Or, more generally stated, that there are identical repetitions. I think that that would need a proof, the assertion that there is an identical repetition. There are always, as far as I have observed, some differences between the first and second statement. Now another point, Burnet in 23e 5, "Anytus was a master tanner, as Cleon had been before him, but he was also one of the two or three leading statesmen of the time. There is a real point in making him a representative of two crafts. He is a type of those craftsmen who fancy that because they knew their own business they were wise in other matters which they knew nothing about. There cannot be any doubt that Socrates maintains the doctrine of one man, one trade, which Plato represents him as making the foundation of his ideal state. And this sentence is a gentle reminder of his objection to business men in government." [Laughter] Yes. Good. There's something funny in that, you see? Now is one man, one trade the Socratic doctrine? Is this so unqualifiedly true? What do you say to that? Some of you have read the Republic. Yes?

Schaeffer: Well he suggests that there's another art...the money-making art is connected...S: I beg your pardon? Schaeffer: The money-making art is involved in several arts.

S: In other words, even the shoe-maker, you mean, because he is both a shoe-maker and a practitioner of the money-making art? But in the ideal state, as he calls it, they don't make money.

R: At the peak, philosophers will have to take up the sideline of being kings, or vice-versa.

S: And, at the end of the Banquet, the comic poet must alas be a tragic poet. And even in the Republic, the sons of Asclepius are praised because they combine the art of the warrior with the art of the physician. These are the things which occur to me immediately. So it is not so simple. And surely the businessman is very...That is very improperly stated. The truth in it would be this: Socrates...not businessmen. But Socrates was not a democrat. The democrat...businessmen, in contradistinction to a landed, property-owner, that was a practically important point. Here is another one. Now here--I think we do not have to go into that. 24a. Now that is something here. In 24a 1-4, immediately after he had mentioned Lycon, will you read this sentence again?

R: "...so that, as I said in the beginning, I should be surprised if I were able to remove this slander from you in so short a time when it has grown so great."

S: Now here we have a reference to something what Socrates said before, and apparently a literal repetition. Now if we turn to the first statement in 18e 5, ff., Socrates says, "I must try to remove in so short a time this slander which you have been exposed to for so long a time." Now he says...the present phrasing

is ambiguous. And it may mean, "I wonder whether I shall be able to remove from you this slander which has become so powerful in so short a time." Namely, in the short time after the Delphic Oracle. That is here ambiguous. And that is a great difference, because there was no ambiguity in the first statement.

In the sequel here of this passage, "This is the complete truth about the content and the causes of the prejudice against me. And yet I know rather well that by laying bare the background of the charge, I make myself hated." Why does he make himself hated by laying bare the background of the charge, the pre-history of the charge? He makes himself hated by the jury, who do not wish to have their heroes or themselves debunked. And this fact, namely, your present hostile reaction to what Socrates just said, testifies to Socrates' telling the truth. They see quite well that Socrates is not speaking here of people with whom they are in no way identical, or do not identify themselves. But Socrates tells them point blank, "I have discovered you or those whom you admire most to be pompous asses." Then naturally they are angry at him, and you can't blame them too much if they condemn him, human nature being what it is. So this much about the charge... about the defense of Socrates against the first accusers. Now before we turn to the present charge, the later charge, we can have a short discussion. Yes?

Q: Isn't it possible that he also means when he says that that in as much as he's obviously making himself less popular rather than more popular, it's obvious that he isn't trying to lie or get out of the charge, and that the only reason he'd say such a thing would be if it is true?

S: Yes, but still it is a great difference. Sure, that is quite true. But the question is of course, even if Socrates was perfectly reconciled to his being condemned and executed, it makes a difference on what ground. I'll tell you a story, not from Plato but from Xenophon. When Socrates was condemned to death, one of his more enthusiastic, irrational admirers, said, "How terrible Socrates, that you have been unjustly condemned to death." Whereupon Socrates said, "Would you wish me to be condemned justly?" [Laughter] Here is the same point. You know, he might have no objection to being condemned, but he may have had the greatest objection to being condemned on certain grounds rather than others. If he was condemned to death because he made a nuisance of himself by being a gadfly, that was one thing; but if he was condemned to death as an atheist, that was another thing. Very obviously. I mean quite neutrally speaking, Socrates was not alone; there were those young people with whom he was associated, and their fate would be affected by the grounds on which he was condemned. Good.

Q: Isn't there a sense in which Socrates might be considered guilty from his own testimony? In that, if, as you were saying in the first lecture, the city's basis of justice is the ancestral, and Socrates by teaching the children to debunk their elders, has in effect corrupted them by making examine that which is elderly and the foundation of the city?

S: Yes, but it is not so simple. Socrates doesn't say that, doesn't admit that. He says these young men, who followed him, examine Athenians. He doesn't say that they examine their fathers or grandfathers or uncles, you know? And there is nothing wrong with debunking a stranger. Surely one can say, if one wants to be very precise, that this could very well imply also debunking one's own father. It could also mean that. Then it would be somewhat graver. But even in

that case, there is a possible excuse. Because if the father pretends to be wiser and is in fact very unwise, then in a way one can say he had it coming. But I admit that it's a more delicate situation. In *The Clouds*, Socrates is presented as, well, as teaching a son to beat his father, beating being a sign of superior wisdom. You know, just as parents are supposed to spank their children in order to educate them, and they are supposed to do that because they are supposed to be wiser, and as it were to instill wisdom via the rod. And if this is true, if the wiser may spank the less wise, then the wise son may spank his uncle or his father. So this problem was there, no doubt. But it is not explicitly mentioned here, for obvious reasons. Yes?

Q: We began by asking the question, whether Socrates could be wiser than the Oracle. Did the Oracle say that Socrates was wiser? And when Socrates is examining the poets, it says that he examines the poets--and in our text it translates seems as givers of oracles.

S: These are of course not the gods, but human beings. The Pythia in some sense.

Q: He seems here to conjoin the knowledge that oracles and poets possess. He distinguishes between the knowledge in which he considers wisdom to play and prophecy, and he says at the end of that section that he went away thinking that he was superior to them.

S: Yes, because if he says something, he would be able to give the reasons why he said that. Whereas the seer, as well as the poet, would not know the reason. I mean the inspired seer would only know that he was inspired to say that. And I believe I mentioned this, that he doesn't say that they say many true things; he says many fine things, which is not identical. It's not the same thing. For example, some untruths can be presented very finely, and then it is something fine without being true. Yes?

Q: In the same passage, he says, "I asked them what they meant," and you maintain that there wasn't a dialogue between Socrates and the poets.

S: If Socrates asked a poet, "Why did you produce this character, or make the choruses sing these particular songs?" and the poet just looks with amazement at the question, and is silent, can you call this a dialogue? Well, in a sense yes, but an abortive dialogue, one could say. Whereas in the case of the statesmen he explicitly speaks of dialogesthai, of having a conversation. I believe that Plato is very careful in these things. If he avoids a term, ha...And the same I suppose would be true in the case of the . She doesn't know. The Pythia--why she said this to Chaecephon?--the god Apollo inspired her to do that. Yes?

Q: You drew the distinction that Socrates was unwilling to call Anytus an orator. In the beginning, Socrates mentions that of all of his accusers--or at least he doesn't distinguish in this first page--they spoke "as persuasively did they talk." And later on, "Not, however, men of Athens, speeches finely tricked out with words and phrases, as theirs are,..." Now what I'm wondering is in what sense could Meletus be considered an orator and Anytus couldn't in the light of...?

S: That is, I believe, not difficult to answer on the basis of what he said at the beginning of the Apology. I mean I stated it at that time as follows: They presented Socrates as a clever speaker. And Socrates says, "Well, you only have to listen to me, you will see that I'm not a clever speaker." Hence, the accusers were not clever speakers, because they were impudent liars. You remember that? You can say they were bad orators, but the difference between a bad orator and not being an orator at all can be disregarded on quite a few occasions. We do this all the time. I mean between a very poor TV repairman and a man who has no knowledge of TV at all, the difference is practically irrelevant. And so we can also say the difference between a poor orator and a non-orator is practically irrelevant.

Q: At 26a 6...S: Can you speak a bit louder? Q: At 23b 6, Socrates makes the statement that he anyone, whether he was a foreigner or a citizen. Do we find this to be strictly true within the dialogue itself? For instance, the sophists... [remainder inaudible]

S: He does not examine?

A: [first part inaudible] ...account of their philosophy. And then he goes on further and asks whether he would like to engage in a dialogue or whether he

S: Well, but is this whatever he does, whether he permits the man to engage in a long speech or only give short answers, in both cases it is an examination. Have you read the Gorgias, for example? Does he not examine Gorgias? Of course, he is a polite man; he wouldn't say, "And now I'm going to examine you." But in fact... And the case of Protagoras, or anybody else. Thrasymachus in the Republic. He examined them all right. But what is remarkable is this: "And if he does not seem to be wise to me," or "When he doesn't seem to be wise, then I show with the assistance of the god that he is not wise." The qualification: "When he doesn't seem to be wise to me." In some cases, the man examined might be wise. That's not excluded. Yes?

Q: He didn't examine the stranger in order to debunk him, I mean there was never any kind of outcome of that.

S: Why not? Think of the situation in the Protagoras. At the beginning young Hippocrates is very eager to become a disciple of Protagoras. Socrates debunks Protagoras in order to protect poor Hippocrates. It's very important to debunk strangers, namely, if they are so exacting as, say, Protagoras is.

Q: Then again in the Theaetetus, Socrates says that he'd rather talk to the young men of Athens, and not to foreigners, no matter how smart they are.

S: No, but he has to talk to Theaetetus because the venerable teacher of Theaetetus, old Theodorus, doesn't wish to engage in conversation. Theodorus was a foreigner and Theaetetus an Athenian. Socrates doesn't make any... He says later on in the Apology that he prefers the Athenians for this purpose, because he has a naturally stronger attachment to Athenians than to foreigners. But if these foreigners are particularly strongly pretending to wisdom, he would of course examine

them, and especially if many Athenians are impressed by their wisdom. Did you want to say something?

Q: Yes. If the poets are not among his first accusers, if they're not angry at him, what is it that leads Meletus to lead the attack?

S: I think I gave an answer to this question, but I will repeat it. When we read this statement about the three kinds of people, we see that he speaks of becoming hated only in the case of the politicians, not in the case of the poets nor in the case of the handicraftsmen. Good. And from this I inferred that, at least up to this point, it is suggested to us that the first or primary accusers were the politicians and the admirers and followers of the politicians, not the two other classes. But then after he had made the suggestion he drops it, and the final statement is at the beginning of 22a 6, ff., that this distinction between the three classes is unimportant. But we have nevertheless had this indication which we must not completely forget. Yes?

Q: Could not the Gorgias be understood as a dialogue [insudible]?

S: Yes. Well, in the first place, Gorgias himself. And only think what is the situation at the beginning, roughly this: that Gorgias says he is not responsible if people whom he teaches the art of speaking use it for wrong purposes, as little as a teacher of boxing or of shooting is responsible if the pupil becomes a murderer. And that means that the art of speaking is neutral in regard to justice and injustice. And this is a grave thing. Thereupon Gorgias is asked, "But must you not do something against possible misuse of what you teach them?" In other words, "Must you not teach them justice before you teach them any cleverness which they might use unjustly?" And then Gorgias says, "Well if they don't happen to know what is just when they come to me, I might tell them what is just." You can imagine what kind of instruction in justice that is, if he would tell him, "Never forget...never cheat, never murder." That can make a deep impression on a sufficiently nasty young man. So closely he's examined. He's sitting on the horns of a dilemma. And the same is even more obvious in the case of the examination of Polus, which takes up a much larger part of the Gorgias. Polus is also a professional orator, teacher of rhetoric. So they are all examined. I mean it would be interesting to see where...do you know any Platonic dialogue where no examination takes place? No, I ask you not as a trap, but honestly. Are Glaucon, Adeimantus in the Republic not examined? I mean are they not examined by the mere fact that, for example, when Socrates discusses war in the fifth book of the Republic, and then Socrates says things which should not be done in war, like burning down a house unnecessarily and killing of civilians, as we would say, and looting, and so on and so on. And when you read Glaucon's reaction to that, and Glaucon makes then a distinction: Yes, one shouldn't do that in wars against Greeks, but in wars against barbarians? Another story. Well, is this not an examination of Glaucon's character? I mean, that takes place all the time. I would say...unless it is a dialogue in which Socrates is in examination, is examined--that is very rare, like the Parmenides in a sense. Socrates is very young. But in a way also in the Banquet, when he is examined by Diotima. That also could happen. Mr. ?

A: The Timaeus. S: Pardon? A: Timaeus.

S: But there of course he is not examined, except to the extent that he seems

to show he could not make that speech. But this is not certain. It is also possible that he did not wish to make that speech about the universe. But that is not the clear case, I would say. At any rate, the general rule is that the interlocutors of Socrates are always examined, without Socrates necessarily intending it to be. But they...they reveal themselves.

Q: But is it these orators who are accusing him?

S: No, these orators, these are not...We make a simple distinction: these are not rhetoricians, of whom he speaks here, but orators. A rhetorician, let us say, is a teacher of orators, and the orator is the man who executes the art itself.

Q: What about the Apology itself? S: Pardon? A: The Apology.

S: In the Apology...Yes. Is there anyone examined here?

A: Well, Meletus, but also...S: Meletus, surely. A: But Socrates himself. He is being forced to...

S: Yes, that is true. But does he not also by the way in which he speaks address himself toward the Athenian jury examine them? And reveal them to us, and if possible to themselves? Does he not also do that? So in other words, it is too simple to understand the examination along the lines of this Uncle Sam, you know? "Did you examine yourself today? I want you." That is not the way in which Socrates proceeds. Are there any other...Yes.

Q: Would you explain the connection between the charge that Socrates investigates the things in the heavens and in the earth, and that he makes the weaker speech seem the stronger? They seem to be somehow connected in this accusation, whereas we would normally think of making the weaker speech seem the stronger is not a part of the natural scientist but more of a

S: Yes. That we would do on the basis of the Platonic tradition [already?]. I mean, you know, a general and vague familiarity with Plato. If you take Aristophanes' Clouds, and surely taking into consideration that it is a comedy, and never forgetting that, nevertheless what does Socrates do there? Two things. He is a physiologist, a student of nature, and he is a teacher of rhetoric. So apparently there was thought to be a connection between these seemingly totally heterogeneous things. Don't forget that men like Gorgias and Protagoras also were concerned with the nature of things. Rhetoric, the art of speaking, this cannot be elaborated properly--scientifically, as we say--without knowledge of the nature of things. Proof: Plato's own Phaedrus, where this is said. So that to speak well, in the strict sense, presupposes that one think well. But how can one think well if one does not think well about the most comprehensive things? Physiologie. In the wide sense. This is no difficulty. So. Yes?

Q: But why does thinking about physiologia lead to speaking well, or to the art of rhetoric?

S: Just turn around what I said now. If you think well, you are by this fact enabled--perhaps not yet completely enabled--to speak well. If you think well,

you may still need some other knowledge in order to speak well. If you think of the externals, for example, use of gestures, and when should you smile and when should you look grave, that is not implied in that, that needs some special arrangement. But so speaking well requires something in addition, otherwise there would be no rhetoric as a separate study. But if you think well you fulfill the most important condition for speaking well.

Q: But that's not making the weaker speech stronger.

S: No. And therefore it is also interesting that in the actual charge, making the weaker speech stronger doesn't occur. But this simply reflects...I mean the simplest way of understanding it--I don't say the only way--is to look at the Socrates of The Clouds. I mean Socrates, this pre-Delphic Socrates, whenever that was, whether it was in 430 or 440, no one can say that. Combined, as other men, too, did, physiologia with rhetoric. This also was the general notion, that there are some...there is this strange thing coming up now in Athens which didn't exist before in Athens, at any rate--maybe it existed in other places, like Sicily--that men combined physiologia with rhetoric. And both are suspect. The first because that is not a man's business to pry into the secrets of the gods. To study the things aloft. And the other is obviously to make the weaker speech stronger is obviously something disreputable. So you wanted to say something. No, you.

Q: In the case of the artisans, I was wondering, if the fact that they're carrying on their own art skillfully causes them to believe they know many other and greater things, is that just some sort of accident due, perhaps to the political situation in Athens in a democracy, or is it something intrinsic to, say, a shoemaker, that he has beyond shoemaking.

S: Socrates seems to presuppose such an inclination, that one overestimates one's specialty. And thinks that this particular field, in which one has solid knowledge, is the most important. That seems to be implied. But he doesn't say that all men, all craftsmen would. Good. Now then I suggest that we begin--today we just have time for that--with the next speech against the present accusers.

R: "Now so far as the accusations are concerned...sufficient defense before you..."

S: "Let this be a sufficient defense..."

R: "...but against Meletus, the good...other new spiritual beings."

S: Yes. That is impossible. "Daemonic things," let us say. We will later on find out what that means.

R: "Such is the accusation."

S: "Something of this kind is the accusation."

R: "But let us examine each point of this accusation."

S: Now let us stop here. So this is then...we begin now the defense against the present accusers, and more particularly against Meletus. This section which we read is the introduction. Socrates makes first an explicit transition from the first accusers to the present ones, and then quotes the present indictment. Here at the very beginning--"this defense being sufficient before you," he says. Now in Greek it is pros humas, followed immediately by pros de Meleton. Now there is a certain allusion in this, because the same Greek word, pros, is used in two different senses. First it means "about the first accusers let this be enough of a defense toward you," "with a view to you," in Latin ad vos, ad homine, toward you. And then in the case of Meletus, it means "against Meletus." Now "as if they were another set of accusers," he says in b 7. Well that is what I suspected all the time. There are no other two sets of accusers. There are no two sets of accusers. There was only one set of accusers, and there were no first accusers.

Now when he comes to the charge, to quote him, he says "It runs somehow in the following manner," i.e., he says from the beginning, "it is not a literal .". And at the end he says, "The indictment is of this kind." The charge is not literally quoted. And we have to discuss it quickly. The charge is...has been preserved in Diogenes Laertius, Book II, section 40. And I'll read it to you, but you have to look at the Platonic text to see the differences. "Socrates commits a crime or acts unjustly by not believing the gods which the city believes, but introducing other new daimonic things. He also commits an unjust act by corrupting the young." This wording is almost identical with that which we find at the beginning of Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. Xenophon also doesn't quote literally. He also says, "The charge was taute tas," "some of this...about of this kind." But Xenophon makes only an infinitesimal charge...change. He changes eisegoumenos, which I translate by "introducing," by eisicheron, which means "bringing in." The first means literally "lead in." And Xenophon says, "bring in." A very subtle change, compared with the immense changes which Socrates has made...which Plato makes. Now what are the Platonic changes? There are four which I observe. First, Socrates [brings?] the corruption charge prior to the impiety charge, the atheism charge. Now we are prepared for that because according to Socrates' description, the charge arose from what the young followers of Socrates did. People got angry at this and said, "Socrates corrupts the young." And then when they were asked, "What is he doing?" they didn't know what to say. They couldn't say "Because he has shown us up as pompous asses." So they said, "Well he investigates the things aloft," and so on. So this is . The second point is he connects the two items of the charge more closely than they are connected in the original, by omitting one, "he commits an unjust act," and the following "and." And thirdly, he emphasizes "new" by putting it at the end. I don't remember now how Fowler translated. Well, "not believing in the gods which the city believes, but in other daimonic things that are new." That's emphatic. This emphasis is not in the original.

To summarize these points, corruption of the young is the fundamental point. And there is only one crime, one criminal act, the corruption. Now the impiety element comes in is not clear. But there is another very interesting change. Plato's Socrates omits the "introducing," you know? "Not believing in the gods which the city believes, but introducing other new daimonic things." That is very important for what happens soon afterward. By doing this, he in fact replaces "introducing" by "believing." You need here a participle, you need a verb here, and though there is no new verb, you will make the first verb, the only verb, do

Now let us continue our discussion. Before Socrates defends himself against the formal indictment, he has told his judges three stories. First, the story of the first accusers, the story of Callias and Euenus, and third, the story of the Delphic Oracle. The story of the first accusers surrounds the two other stories. These three stories were new to his audience. According to his emphatic claim, they were true stories. We have no means of proving or disproving that claim by independent, external evidence. But there is some internal evidence which makes us doubt whether there were any first accusers different from the actual accusers. That was the point we reached last time. But be this as it may, the first accusers proved to be above all the political men and their admirers, whom Socrates had debunked, or more precisely the first accusers proved to be those Athenians who were debunked by Socrates' young companions. This being the case, the charge of corrupting the young arose naturally. All of us would regard someone who poked fun at us, or makes other people poke fun at us, as corrupters of the sane. So the corruption charge is the immediate reaction. And since the corruption charge needs some support other than this dysfunctional truth, they fell on the...back on the accusation of impiety. Now in accordance with this, the corruption charge first, the impiety charge afterward, Socrates changed the very wording of the indictment as we have seen. By making the corruption charge precede the impiety charge. Now we have observed some other changes which Socrates makes in the indictment, but we do not have to repeat that now.

Now we come to the next section, and there is first...First we have in 24c 4 to 26b 2 Socrates' refutation of Meletus' corruption charge, and later on then of course the refutation of Meletus' impiety charge. But first regarding the first part, in 24c 4 to 25a 11, Socrates determines the precise meaning of the corruption charge, and he will act similarly in the case of the impiety charge. Now we begin then, Mr. Reinken, at 24c 4. And will you read until...

R: "But let us examine each point of this accusation." S: Can you read a bit louder? R: "But let us examine...that you have never cared about it?"

S: Let's stop here. There is a constant punning in the original on the name of Meletus. The Greek word for "caring" and so that as if, in other words, as if the man were "Mr. Carer," and you claimed to care for the youth. This is not particularly important. By the way "wrongdoing," that is in Greek always here "acting unjustly," "committing a crime." This one must keep in mind. What Socrates says is very simple. "If you know who corrupts the young, you must know who improves them. For if all men corrupt the young, corrupting the young is inevitable and therefore cannot be a crime." Meletus is obviously unprepared for this move of Socrates, and that is shown by his silence, which Socrates points out. Now let us go on and read the next point.

R: "But tell, my good man, who makes them better?...this very thing, the laws."

S: Let us stop here. So Meletus gives in a way a good answer. The thing which makes the young good are the laws. No more respectable answer is thinkable. But Socrates is dissatisfied. Because, as he implies, the laws do not improve by themselves. They must be executed, observed, and preserved. For this purpose they must be known, known by human beings. The laws are not self-subsistent beings;

this I say with a view to what we will read later in the Crito, where the laws are presented as self-subsisting beings addressing Socrates and preventing him from escaping from jail. So there must be human beings who know the law. Socrates is silent about the fact that before the laws can be known, namely, known as laws, they must have been made laws. And therefore this is quite strange expression, "who knows the laws." First who makes the laws? Now why should Socrates be silent about that, that the laws have to be made? Well, there is a general rule that the laws are made...are dependent on the regime, on the political order. The power structure, I believe it would be called today. Good. So, and now in a democracy the regime is ofcourse the demos, the predominant part of the society. And now what Socrates implies--in other passages he doesn't [merely?] imply it--the river cannot rise higher than its source. So if the demos is the ultimate ground of the laws, than the laws are not likely to be truly improvers of the young. This critique of the laws is implied in this brief exchange here. But nevertheless the whole issue will come up soon, because...since Socrates says, "Who knows the laws?" the answer will be eventually in a few steps, "The demos know the laws." And therefore the demos is the improver of the youth of Athens. Now will you go on, Mr. Reinken?

R: Meletus answers, "These men, Socrates, the judges." What are you saying, Meletus? Are these gentlemen..."

S: No, "gentlemen" is of course a preposterous thing here. "These ones." "Gentlemen" never occurs here. "These ones." "Those here, whom we see. Are they able to judge the young...to educate the young? And do they in fact make them better?" What a preposterous suggestion. Yes?

R: "Certainly..." great plenty of helpers you speak of."

S: Let us stop here for one second. So. Now he swears here, "by Hera," the wife of Zeus, and this is generally speaking a woman's oath, an oath made by women, and so Socrates presents himself as a kind of woman. You remember his other irregular oath, "by the Dog," which we observed before. Why does he here indicate his not being a man? Well because the implication of the whole statement is that these people sitting around here, these...a representative part of the demos, have one quality: they are all males, adult males, they are men. And therefore the indication is this oath "by Hera." All adult males, if they are Athenian citizens, are able to educate the young, and in fact make them better. That is an assertion into which Meletus is maneuvered by Socrates. Yes. Now?

R: "But how about this?...These also..."

S: Who is among the listeners? Why does he speak of the listeners here in particular? Yes?

A: Well, Plato.

S: Plato is one of them, yes. But that would be very funny if Socrates would be a corrupter and Plato an improver of the youth. Yes...Someone...Yes.

Schaeffer: Does the womanly oath signify, in other words, that Socrates is differentiating any that he could have improving people from what everybody

else...

S: Yes. Well, I mean there is a joke, as I understand it...consists in this: A man lives out of the house, the marketplace, and if he is truly a man, in the heat of battle. And doing deeds. Whereas women are sitting in the house, and talk. Now Socrates' peculiar activity is obviously more akin to that of women in this sense than that of men, although he did go...he was a warrior, but his heart was not in it, as you can see most simply from the beginning of the Charmides, where Socrates is asked...he comes back from war and he's asked about his war experience. And the way in which he pushes them aside, he's much more interested in what the youth of Athens are doing in Athens. Read just the first three lines of the Charmides and you'll see the point. Yes. Good. Mr. Reinken?

R: "And how about the senators?...e it seems, make them excellent..."

S: No, now here he could very well translate "gentleman." "Make them gentlemen."

R: "...make them gentlemen, except myself,...that is what I mean."

S: Now let us stop here for a moment. He frequently says, by the way, not the young ones, but the younger ones. Which I believe is an allusion to the fact that Meletus himself is rather young. He is beyond the corruptible age because he is no longer unqualifiedly young, but only younger. Now all Athenians make the young ones into perfect gentlemen. By making this preposterous statement, Meletus goes much beyond Anytus in Plato's Meno, 92e 3, who only says that every perfect gentleman among the Athenians is a teacher of virtue. This is a more reasonable statement than to say what Meno [eio] says here. Now again let us not overlook the seriousness behind this gross joke. This is a democracy. A democracy implies...expects men to believe that democracy is the best regime. Because if it is not the best regime, why not transform it into the best regime? Subversive thought. So this is the first premise. The second premise: But the best regime is best with a view to virtue. Hence, democracy should be best with a view to virtue. Now Socrates--to come back to the [word?] here--Socrates is the sole corrupter in Athens. In other words, there is a radical opposition between Socrates and the city, i.e., the demos. This Socrates does in order to determine the precise meaning of Meletus' charge. Whether Meno [eio] believed this before he replied to Socrates or not, we cannot say, but this is, so to say, his final position into which he has been brought by Socrates. And now we come to Socrates' refutation of the corruption charge as now more precisely defined. And let us now begin here where we left off.

R: "You have condemned me to great unhappiness!...you hale me into court."

S: You see again the recurrence of that punning. Now what Socrates says here is this: Regarding all living beings, the corrupters are many and the improvers are few. But man is a living being, hence it stands to reason that there will be many corrupters and few improvers. And that is the refutation of Meletus' preposterous assertion. Now let us read the end of this part.

R: "But besides, tell us,...Of course not."

S: Now [we have to] understand this part of the argument. Take the case

of horses or dogs. Does anyone wish to make a dog vicious universally, meaning also to himself? That's of course absurd. And in this respect everyone has an interest in making the dog nice, and the horse, too. And the same would apply to human beings. Yes? That is developed in the Euthyphro, for example, but it is here implied. Yes?

R: "Come then, do you hale me in here...Melatus never cared much or little for these things."

S: Let us stop here for a moment. So the argument is simple: no one wishes to be harmed, but to corrupt someone means to transform him into a harmful being, and hence, in particular, harmful to oneself. Hence no one corrupts anyone voluntarily, i.e., knowingly. And there may be involuntary corruption, but this cannot be a punishable offense. So Socrates has taken care of that. Now Socrates proves in this way that there never was, and that there never will be, anyone who corrupts guiltily voluntarily. But does not the same apply to all crimes? Because no one is so foolish as with open eyes to harm himself. So in raising this question Socrates questions all penal law, because all crimes would be reduced to involuntary actions. There is a famous caricature of this thought in Butler's Erewhon, which some of you will have read. And we don't have to go to Butler; there is much in present day legal thought inclining in this direction, that all crime is due to circumstances wholly alien to the criminal. There is a long discussion of this subject from a point of view closer to legislation, in Plato's Laws, Book IX, 861d, ff., which you might read. At any rate, Socrates, in opposition to the city as such--not only to the desocracy--...professes to be in opposition to the city because he questions the penal law and therewith, given the pivotal state of the penal law, the law as a whole.

Now here we'll make a brief stop before we turn to the second part of Melatus' charge. Yes?

Q: Is it true that that questions any voluntary crime? Because in the refutation about corrupting youth voluntarily, part of the crucial part is that he's corrupting people with whom he associates, but if he were corrupting people whom he were not to see again...

S: Well apart from the fact that there are Socratic utterances to this effect, that all wrongdoing--even in the very Apology here--is involuntary, but would this not be true, also, of other crimes? For example, well, assuming that there is an enforced penalcode, is it not so that, let's say, by murdering, stealing, and cheating, and so on, you harm yourself?

A: Only if you get caught.

S: Surely that makes it grava. But assuming that there is a relatively competent law enforcing agency, the chances are very great. And some other complications--you never can tell whether they will catch up with you, and so forth.

Q: Doesn't that also lead to a circular argument, though, because even if you have a society in which you don't punish criminals because they harming themselves, then it may become in their interest to be criminals, in which they now are no longer doing it from ignorance.

S: Yes. There are quite a few difficulties with Socrates' thesis, but still we have to consider here that this is part of a formal speech of defense, by someone who has been accused of a capital crime. And by bringing in this assertion he gives some substance to simple-minded people, at least, simple-minded hearers, that he is somewhat unreliable as a citizen altogether. Because he had this view. I mean even in present day America, some members of the Supreme Court are severely blamed for making law enforcement difficult. You know this kind of discussion. This would be all the more true of Socrates. If there is no voluntary wrongdoing of any kind. Yes?

Q: To show that no one committed a crime, wouldn't he have to show that everyone was aware of this reasoning of his? That making other people worse will make them worse? If I don't know that I may well commit a crime voluntarily.

S: No, the ignorance...that is only ignorance. This ignorance works only in its own element. Only if you are ignorant of it are you perfectly...are you perfectly innocent. If you know it, in a way, you have already transcended this simple innocence of the criminal, who has no doubt of his acting rightly--meaning rightly not in the sense of legally, but soundly. Good. Now we turn to the second part of the refutation of Meletus' charge, namely, the impiety charge. Socrates proceeds in the same way as before. First he determines the precise meaning of the charge, and then he refutes the charge. Now let's begin.

R: "But nevertheless, tell us,...Very decidedly that is what I say."

S: Yes. In other words Socrates corrupts the young exclusively by teaching them not to revere or believe in the gods revered or believed in by the city. In other words, Socrates is not guilty of any morals charge--corrupting the young could also imply that. Apparently Socrates has subordinated impiety to corruption by bringing in corruption as the first charge, and impiety as the second. In fact he does just the opposite. The corruption consists entirely in his impiety or the spreading of his impiety. Yes?

R: "Then, Meletus, for the sake of these very gods about whom our speech now is,..."

S: That is a peculiar oath. Yes?

R: "...speak still more clearly both to me and to these..."

S: No, here he says "these many." Yes.

R: "For I am unable to understand...that you do not believe in gods at all."

S: Yes. Now if this is a trap it is a very successful trap. Now Meletus means, then, that Socrates is an unqualified atheist, and the teacher of atheism. This is, indeed, I think the authentic meaning of the indictment as we know it from Diogenes Laertius, where Socrates is...he is bringing in, leading in, bringing in new divinities, not nomizo, not believing in, worshipping. I discussed that difference at the end of last meeting at some length. So this is now clear. Socrates...The meaning of the indictment has been restored against Socrates' corruption of the indictment by substituting believing, nomizo, for bringing in, leading in, eisegoumenos. So? Yes?

R: "You amaze me, Meletus!...as the rest of mankind do?"

S: In other words, "You, Meletus, say that Socrates is a monster. All men believe in the cosmic gods," as we can call them, the gods which everyone can see, whereas only the Greeks believe in the Greek gods, in the Olympian gods. There is an interesting parallel to that in Aristophanes' comedy, The Peace, where some character says that the sun and the moon have been conspiring against all gods, meaning against all Olympian gods, to betray Greece to the barbarians. Since the Greeks sacrifice to the gods, whereas the barbarians sacrifice to the sun and the moon. So the belief in these visible gods, that is universal [to the human race?] therefore nothing to be proud of, because everyone does that. But the high thing is to worship the Olympian gods. Now there is an interesting parallel to that in Deuteronomy 4:19, which, of course, without any such malicious intent, presents a striking parallel: "and lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun and the moon and the stars, all the host of heaven, shouldst thou be driven to worship them, and serve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all nations under the whole of heaven." In other words, the worship of the visible gods has been assigned by the Biblical God to all the nations except the chosen nation. That is strictly parallel to the suggestion of...we find in Aristophanes. The Olympian gods were worshipped by the Greeks, and the cosmic gods are a matter for all men except the chosen people, in this case the Greeks. It's a remarkable parallel. Yes. Now let us go on.

R: "No, by Zeus, judges,...you don't, not in the least."

S: You see here the great density of oaths, both of Socrates and Meletus, in this section. Now what do you think of this argument here up to this point? Socrates shows that a certain statement ascribed to him by Meletus is in fact the statement of somebody else, of Anaxagoras. Yes?

Schaeffer: He seems to be admitting, not only that he doesn't believe in the sun and moon as gods, but that the rest of them don't believe in them as gods either. Because Anaxagoras...at least Anaxagoras [remainder inaudible].

S: I can't follow you. It is granted that Anaxagoras didn't believe in the divinity of the heavenly bodies.

Schaeffer: Well when he said that "I am like the rest of them," that implies all them except me.

S: That is Meletus' accusation, but Socrates...No, but Meletus accuses Socrates of having...of holding this and this view. And Socrates says, "This is not my view, this is Anaxagoras' view." Yes?

A: Well it implies Socrates is at least conversant with the views of Anaxagoras and that he must have read them, and so then he has really studied science and...

S: That is quite true. But I think the more immediate thing...the fact that this view was set forth by Anaxagoras does not yet prove that it cannot be shared by Socrates, obviously. Therefore it is not sufficient as a refutation. The refutation comes in the sequel. In other words up to this point, Socrates has made

clear the meaning of the charge: Socrates is an unqualified atheist. And from here on to the end of the Meletus section, we will find the refutation of the atheism or impiety charge. Now let us begin.

R: Is there any difference between pros and ma?

S: There is one...Sure. Pros with the genitive, as you see, means literally "from someone toward."

R: And Socrates uses that pros.

S: No. Well, I mean if you start with this literal meaning of pros with the genitive, [that will mean?] "you who come toward me from Zeus." But I don't think that...I have never found this as an accepted meaning, which doesn't mean that it may not be ultimately that. In other words, not that you call Zeus as a witness, but that you ascribe to the man to whom you speak that he is coming, as it were, from Zeus. That would be according to the literal and primary meaning of pros with the genitive. But how far...ordinarily stated it's just equal...equivalent to ma. Yes.

R: "You cannot be believed, Meletus,...very violent and unrestrained,..."

S: Not "violent," I would not...hubristes--"insolent pride," "insolently proud," "a mocker," This is more...And "incapable of self control."

R: "...insolent and uncontrolled and actually...the conduct of a jester."

S: In other words Meletus contradicts himself. That is Socrates' assertion, which he will prove. And Meletus knows that he contradicts himself. He is therefore a man who jokes. But since this is not a joking matter, accusing someone of a crime, he is a man lacking self control. You know there are sometimes practical jokers who cannot resist temptations to engage in practical jokes which are, in given circumstances, criminal actions. Something of this kind is [happening?] here. Now if he is a man without self restraint, who cannot overcome his urge to make practical jokes of this nature, then he is obviously in need of the ordinary remedy for that, and that in Greek, akolasia, self control, he needs kolasis, he needs punishment, and not instruction, to use the Socratic alternative given in 26a 7. But could one not also say that Socrates is guilty of this kind of insolence since he is responsible for that contradiction by his substituting in the charge "believing" for "bringing in." So that it would be then a kind of high class comedy, where both the accuser and the defendant joke, play with the gravest matters--with the life of one of them, at least is at stake. One cannot completely suppress this reflection. Yes!

R: "Join me, then, gentlemen,...in my accustomed manner."

S: This is one of the other cases in which there is an explicit reference to an earlier remark, and here to 17c 6 to 18a 1, where Socrates excused his way of speaking by his lack of forensic experience and where he does not refer to his dialogic procedure, i.e., to his refuting people by questioning them. So this confirms my general assertion, there is never an identical repetition. There is always some change, because naturally, if it is an intelligent conversation

--at least on one side an intelligent conversation--the situation will have changed ten minutes later. I mean it cannot be simply identical. Yes?

R: "Is there any human being who believes...in demons? There is not."

S: Now let us stop here for one moment. Now Socrates here prepares gradually the transition from the thought [sounds like: "nomizei dus"/ simply, which can mean "worshipping the gods," "respecting the gods," to [sounds like: "nomizei ans dus"/], which means "believing that gods are." That is a point which you find, for example, also in Burnet's commentary, that the isene was in no way whether men believed in the existence of the gods, but only compliance or non-compliance with Athenian religious practices, the cult. Now it is clearly a question here according to Socrates of whether the gods are, because a cult cannot be sincere, or from the heart, if the beings worshipped are not felt to be, to exist. Meletus grants here a bit too much. There may be things pertaining to demons--for example, sacrifices--without there being demons. People can worship non-existent beings. Or take a simple example, there may be things pertaining to witchcraft--say, broom-sticks--without there being witches. There's no difficulty. This thought we can easily execute. So...I mean the example of horses is not surprising because that came before, but why he now brings in flute-players I do not see. That I do not quite follow, but it is not very important. Now let us go on.

R: "Thank you for replying reluctantly...But if I believe in demons,..."

S: No, "If I hold demonic things to be,..."

R: "...hold demonic things, it is quite inevitable...you do not answer."

S: Let us stop here. One cannot hold, hold in respect, demonic things without holding in respect demons. I emphasise the fact that there is nothing here said in the original of being or existing. This comes out only in the sequel. Yes?

R: "But do we not think the demons are gods...in demons or gods or heroes."

S: Yes. That's the end. So in other words Socrates has...believes, according to the indictment as edited by Socrates, Socrates believes in demonic things. But it is as impossible to believe in demonic things without believing in demons as it is to believe in basic things without believing in horses. Now. So, good. Socrates believes then in demons. And here it is clear; either demons are gods, which is perfectly possible according to Greek usage, or if you do go on to make a distinction, demons being lesser, lower in dignity than the gods, then they will be children of gods, and preferably children who have one divine parent and one human parent. And even in the latter case, least favorable, I still admit the existence of gods, because one parent will be a god, just as I could never say that a mule...recognise that there are mules without recognizing horses, the more noble of their parents. The same would be true. That is the whole argument. But it is based chiefly on the substitution of nomizo, believing in, for ensemeuomai, leading in. And it is quite interesting here that in this final section, the word nomizei, which has this meaning of "believing in," never occurs. Socrates uses only another Greek term, which in ordinary usage has the same [Professor

Strouss here went to the blackboard to write the word and some of this sentence is difficult to make out /...hegeisthai, hegeisthai, not nomiso. Hegeisthai means...the primary meaning of hegeisthai is "leading," i.e., the root of that word "leading in," eisegeisthai, which Socrates had...which rabbit Socrates had made disappear in his big hat. Yes. The end of this passage which Mr. Reinken read seems to mean that the belief in the gods, or in the popular gods, is inseparable from the belief in half-gods. Read again the last line, Mr. Reinken.

R: "...but there is no way for you to persuade...or gods or heroes."

S: Does this not imply that the same man who would...one and the same man would not believe in demons, gods, and heroes. Now if you believe in one of these, say, in gods, you believe automatically in demons and heroes, because the source of the belief is the same, say, Homer. And both things are equally supported by the Homeric doctrine. Now this is then in a way the most important part of the Apology because it is a formal refutation of the charge. It obviously does not prove that Socrates was not an atheist, because it was strictly argued on the basis of the accuser's premise, and only showed that he contradicts himself. That doesn't settle the issue in any way. Is there any point you would like to bring up at this point before we turn to the sequel? Yes?

Q: Is not the introduction of heroes something that hasn't been mentioned before?

S: Yes, that is true. I think that was never mentioned before. But it will be taken up very soon again, and therefore it is a part of the transition to the sequel.

So hitherto it was to a quite amazing degree the plan of the Apology was perfectly lucid. Generally speaking bi-partitions, following the precedent of the accusation. But from now on the plan becomes very obscure. Only one thing one can say safely, that the sequel--that is to say, roughly until the end of this speech in 35--has the same relation to the refutation of Meletus as the long account of the Delphic Oracle and its consequence has to the refutation of the first accusers. Now last you mix up, I will put it here [goes to blackboard].

First Accusers : Delphic Oracle (by Delphic Oracle I mean the whole story of the Delphic Oracle--what Socrates did on the basis of it and so on) =
Meletus (refutation of Meletus) : X (by X I mean the section beginning

now.

This is clear. Necessarily so, because Socrates has proven that Meletus' charge is altogether baseless. And then naturally the question would arise, "But if the charge is altogether baseless, how come that you are accused of this thing? There must be something strange about you, Socrates, that you of all people become the sole target, the sole Athenian target, of this charge." Yes? R: Do you want me to go on? S: Yes, unless there is any...We have first to read the end, where you left off.

R: "Well then, men of Athens,...but the slander and dislike of the many."

S: Phthonos, the last word, can also be more specific than "dislike,"--"envy." It doesn't have to be but it can.

R: "This has condemned many other...that it will stop with me."

S: Let us stop here. This is the conclusion of the defense against Meletus, and the transition to the next section. If Socrates will be condemned, it will be the work not of Meletus and Anytus, these worms, as it were, but of the many who slandered him out of envy. And envy for what? Presumably for his wisdom. He refers here back to 23a 1, ff. where he had not spoken of envy. Here there is no longer any connection with the first accusers. We know already by now what to think about that. I will not repeat it, out of delicacy. Good. And now we come then to the last part of the defense, which begins at this point. Burnet gives it the title, "The divine mission of Socrates." It is a possible title, but we must see whether this is sufficient. And I stated the general function of this section now beginning before, by this proportion I drew on the blackboard. Now let us read first the beginning of the passage, because it has no heading. It has no heading, as all other sections have hitherto had. Therefore we must wait for the development of the [thought? theme?].

R: "But perhaps someone might say:...s just reply:..."

S: "I should reply to him...as a reply to him give this just speech," "just logos." Yes?

R: "You do not speak well, Sir,...he considered death and danger?"

S: Yes. That is very strange. Why does this come up here? The obvious reason is this: "Someone--tis--might say that it is disgraceful to engage in a pursuit through which one runs the risk to die." This is an edikos logos, an unjust speech. To which Socrates opposes his just speech. The unjust speech is made by a man whom Socrates addresses, anthropos, "you human being," that is, not a real man. I occasionally translated it by "Mack," which is very vulgar but gives perhaps some notion. Now Socrates, on the other hand, is a man, aner, even a good man, aner agathos, a good hombre. If the unjust speech were right, the half-gods who died before Troy would be low class people, and this is of course impossible. Socrates thus underlines his belief in beings descended on one side from a god and the other from a human being, as you see. If you have any doubt that he believed that Achilles was the son of a human being, Peleus, and a goddess, Thetis, the doubt is removed by this quotation. He singles out here especially Achilles, who preferred the noble thing--revenge on Hector--although he knew that this was bound to lead to his death. He prefers this revenge on Hector to living. The passage confirms Socrates' belief in half-gods. But apart from that the references to Achilles doesn't seem to be very apt. Socrates was not bent on avenging a friend's death, after all. We know nothing to this effect. And most visibly, he, in contradistinction to the young Achilles, is very old. So why does he just choose Achilles as his mythical parallel? Let us have a cursory glance at the Iliad, Book 18, this passage. Well I will read to you in the English prose translation, "Then answered unto Achilles Thetis, his mother, shedding tears: 'Short-lived, I was, must thou be, then, my child, by what thou asiet, for straightway after Hector is death appointed unto thee.' Then mightily moved spake unto her Achilles, fleet of foot: 'Straightway may I die since I might not succor my comrade that is slain, here [fallen?] far from his country and lack'd my help in his sore need. Now, therefore, since I go not back to my dear native land,

neither have at all been secured to Patroclus nor to all my other comrades that have been slain by noble Hector, but I sit beside my ships a prophetic burden of the earth, I that in war and such a one as none else of the mail-clad Achaeans, though in council ere others better, may strive, perish utterly among or ean, and and [rath?] that stirs even a wise man to be vexed, [rath?] that far sweeter than trickling honey waxes like smoke in the breasts of men, even as I was wroth even now against Agamemnon, king of men." Now these verses, in which Achilles sees the truth about strife and anger, , are of course omitted by Socrates. They would somehow fit in...Socrates improves the text of Homer by speaking of Socrates' doing right to the wrong-doing Hector. This reference to justice is of course entirely absent from the Iliad. So this logos here...When you compare it with the functionally parallel passage, what Socrates says after having refuted the first accusers, in 23c...No, a bit later. 20c 4. That's a parallel to 28b 3. If you have that, do you see what Socrates says there? "Someone of you might perhaps take up the matter." And here he says, "Perhaps someone," meaning, the objection raised in 20a-c, ff. was made by one of you, one of the many decent Athenians. The objection made now by this Mack is below the level of the ordinary, decent Athenian. That I think we must...That I think is quite helpful for understanding the step which is now very slowly and gradually prepared. Yes?

Q: Would you restate those passages again, please?

S: 28b 3--compares that with 20c 4. You know these parallel passages here, the beginning. [Points to blackboard] Both begin with an objection, which a man could make. But in the first case the objector is an ordinary Athenian, "one of you." In the second case it is not an ordinary, decent Athenian but a very low-class fellow who doesn't know that there are things more respectable than mere living. Good. Yes? And now let us go on where we left off.

R: "For thus it is, men of Athens, in truth;...and ran the risk of death..."

S: Let us stop here. Now Socrates makes now quite clear that his just speech--namely, death is a lower consideration than disgrace-- is a speech accepted by the Athenians. As he puts it here, he took his position in the ranks and didn't run away "like anybody else." So this is what every Athenian of normal decency would do. And this makes it all the more necessary to raise the question, if this principle--disgrace is worse than death--is generally accepted in Athens, why does Socrates introduce such a sub-normal anthropos, mere human being, with precisely this assertion, that death is worse than disgrace? Did I make clear the difficulty? Your expressions speak against this hopeful assumption. Pardon? A: I didn't understand it. S: Here begins a new section, the meaning of which is not clear except in a very general way, that it must be an explanation of Socrates' becoming the target of persecution. He has proven that he is utterly innocent. Why then became he suspect of the crime? This question must be answered again. But otherwise we do not know what he is doing here. And he begins it with bringing in the unjust speech of a low-class, nameless fellow. Why does he do that? I mean a man who holds the view which none of his judges holds. Socrates is in perfect agreement with his judges regarding this principle--disgrace is worse than death. Why does he bring in such a criminal point of view? Lady, did you now... I forgot your name. No, this lady. Did you now understand it? A: Yes. S: Good. So at least...Yes?

Shulsky: But in addition to being a very dishonorable point of view, that would also be the point of view held by some of the nobility. For instance, Callicles in the *Gorgias* states that "You should be ashamed of yourself, Socrates, for doing...for disregarding important business that could save your life and expending your life doing things that lead you ultimately to persecution."

S: So in other words what the point of view...I mean what the gentlemanly point of view is is not as clear as I presented it. There is a certain ambiguity. Perhaps you are right. But up to this point we have only this: Here a criticism of Socrates made by a low-class fellow, and followed by the assertion that everyone, Socrates like every other Athenian, acted on the opposite principle. So we must wait then.

Q: Is it a point, though, that if somebody says to him, "Why are you getting yourself into trouble?" they are implicitly assuming that what he's doing is not important, and not obeying somebody's orders, and that by saying, "Well look, you're really doing the same thing as telling a soldier to run away from his post," he is therefore emphasizing the fact that doing his duty is analogous to a soldier's duty and that their objection is a trivial one.

S: You spoke so quick that it was...

A: I'm sorry. He is making...Someone might perhaps say to him, "Why are you getting yourself into trouble?" And if he merely said, "Well, it's my duty," this might be oratorically less effective than if he said, "Well, look, you're in the same position as some ignorant lout who tells a soldier that he should run away from his position instead of obeying..."

S: Still but why does he make it so clear, as he does to one reading it with ordinary care, that this criticism is that of the lout, made by a lout? And the ordinary, the average member of the jury does not share this point...Socrates seems to try to get...to appeal to the ground common to him with his judges. I think that is true. But what he does next and immediately is to make clear what the difference between him and his judges is. The principle is the same. One must obey one's superiors regardless of danger of death. And now the question is only, who are superiors par excellence? Are these the elected commanders, the commanders elected by the demos of Athens? Or some higher beings? That is the transition. It will become immediately clear from the sequel. Will you read on?

R: "...but when the god gave me a station,...wise when I am not."

S: Now let us stop here for one moment. Now Socrates returns to what distinguishes him from the Athenians, after having emphasized what connects him with them. The unjust speech of that lout is beneath the Athenians. Socrates' case is above the Athenians. Now what distinguishes Socrates from all the other Athenians is that he has...he obeys directly a superior much higher than any superior elected by the Athenians, namely, he obeys the god. We know the story of the Delphic Oracle. And the god has commanded him, moreover, now something which didn't appear so clearly before, has commanded him to philosophize. What philosophizing means is in no way explained here. It can have the very crude, vulgar meaning where it means to strive for what is now called culture--being interested in music and sculptures, and this kind of thing. And it can also have the gravest and

severest muzzing, dedicating oneself to the understanding of the fundamentals of the universe, the whole. This is not explained. The word, the use of the word, is of course of importance. And now he goes on, and he says if he had not lived as he in fact did, he would be rightly accused of atheism on three grounds, three grounds, the three grounds being disobeying the Oracles (because a man who believes in the gods will obey the Oracles), fearing death (is a proof of atheism), and believing to be wise while one is not wise. Yes?

Q: Now the Oracle just said that he was : the wisest man; it really didn't tell him to go and find out.

S: But in human wisdom. Or...what do you mean by that?

A: Well if you say that Socrates' life was only to obey the god, philosophize, actually from his previous statement about the Oracle in Delphi, it looks like the Oracle said only he was the wisest man; it didn't give him an order, in other words.

S: But to what extent is this an objection to what I just said?

A: Well you say that Socrates is demonstrating that he is obeying the god.

S: That he's demonstrating that he's obeying the god?

A: That his life...

S: I don't think I said that: I only...There is a certain difficulty here because he introduces another word, philosophizing. What does that mean? That's in no way clear. We'll come back to that question later on. The second point which I made is this, that Socrates, if he did not obey the god, then could one justly accuse him of not believing in the existence of the gods because he does three things: first, he would disobey the Oracle--the Oracle allegedly commanding him to philosophize; secondly, because he fears death, and thirdly, because he believes to be wise without being wise? Now these three facts are...These things would be signs of atheism. That is the question. We must consider here that we had formerly three other signs of atheism mentioned. Do you remember which they were? Pardon?

Q: You mean what he's accused of studying? S: Yee. Now enumerates that.

A: What is below or beneath the earth, what is in the air or in the heavens, and ... S: Making the weaker logos the stronger one. Yee. So in other words, Socrates reminds us here of the three popular signs of atheism: investigating the things aloft, investigating the things beneath the earth, and making the weaker logos the stronger one. And he substituted now three signs which seem to be more reliable than the first three ones, and they are the ones he mentions here. Now what's your question?

Q: Surely two of those things contradict what he had explicitly told us the Oracle actually said, that is to say, he explicitly told us the Oracle never told him to do anything at all. He deduced that the Oracle was telling him something. And therefore...

S: Can you repeat that last sentence?

Q: Yes. He explicitly said in his story about the Oracle that the Oracle did not in fact tell him to do anything at all. S: Yes. Q: Therefore what he is really obaying is his own deduction about what the god intended.

S: Yes, but this is the point. You see, the Oracle is as a matter of course enigmatic. And Apollo may very well give a commission, impose a task on a man, by making an unintelligible factual statement. Is this not possible?

Q: Yes. I wanted to go on, that in a sense he has believed himself to be wise by believing that he knows what the Oracle means. And second, that...

S: But that he found out the hard way. I mean there is nothing immodest in that.

Q: And second, that on the direct reading of the Oracle, believing himself to be wise would be a religious thing to do, because after all the Oracle told him that he was the wisest man in the world.

S: That is not exactly...This is already a change. What the god literally said, or the Pythia literally said, was "No one is wiser than Socrates," which goes together with a great deal of folly. Can go together with a great deal of folly. But there is some misunderstanding which I cannot remove because I don't see it clearly enough. The point which I made, I repeat it, is this: Socrates speaks here of three signs of atheism--disobeying an Oracle, fearing death, and believing to be wise while one is not wise. And this contrasts strongly with the three popular signs of atheism: investigating the things aloft, investigating the things beneath the earth, and making the weaker logos the stronger one. This I believe one cannot deny. Now the question is, why does Socrates make this substitution? Well, it is clear. Socrates does not believe that the three popular signs are good, are clear symptoms of the disease in question, whereas these three ones are clear symptoms. The second point is, why does he put...assign "fearing death" the central position? And that will become clear in the sequel. The easiest thing to understand is that disobeying a divine command is a sign of atheism. It's plausible, but by no means necessary. Jonah, in the book of Jonah, was not an atheist, and yet tried to disobey God as you know, because he found it very uneasy to do the kind of things with which he was commissioned. But let us leave it at the somewhat more simple Socratic version of this thought. Yes, now go on, Mr. Reinken.

R: "For to fear death, gentlemen,...I do not think I know."

S: "The things in Hades," is the literal translation, which is preferable on every ground.

R: "...the things in Hades, I do not think I know...which I know are bad."

S: Now let us stop here. So. Now you see Socrates had given three signs of atheism. The first was self explanatory. The only question concerned the second and third--fearing death and believing to be wiser than one is. Now Socrates reduces number three to number two. Fearing death is pretending to know the things which one does not know properly; the things in Hades, as Mr. Reinken

saw immediately, the things beneath the earth--has this double meaning, that is, not only the oil and the coal but also things in Hades. Of course there is another possibility. Granting if you do not know sufficiently the things in Hades, there is an alternative to fearing them and not fearing them, namely, to suspend one's judgment, which is the wise thing to do whenever we do not have sufficient knowledge. Suspend one's judgment as to whether life in Hades is good or bad. We know too little about it. But still, precisely because one does not know, one has ground for apprehension. After all the terrible stories might be true. I cannot refute these, and then I would perhaps not be as apprehensive as someone who is sure that these frightful stories are true, but that is a question. The very uncertainty can increase the apprehension. Read Pascal's famous wager on this subject. Now here we see already a bit more of the connection of these thoughts. Shortly before, at the beginning of this part of his speech, he had referred to Achilles, without mentioning his name. What did Achilles say of Hades when he was already in it and knew it perfectly? Do you remember?

R: It was miserable.

S: Yes. Well and Plato himself quotes it in the Republic, 106c. He says it is better to be a living serf of a poor man on the earth than to be the ruler over all the dead in Hades. So Achilles is the greatest witness speaking for the loud's view, for the unjust speech. We must add immediately that this terribly disgraceful speech becomes known to us only through Odysseus who reports of this conversation with Achilles, and Odysseus was a notorious liar. [laughter] So we can very well, for the greater glory of Achilles, dismiss it. But to repeat, Achilles himself seems to agree with the unjust speech of Mack. That doesn't clarify the situation sufficiently, but it is a stone of the few stones which we need in order to build up the structure. Yes?

R: "And therefore, even if you acquit me...brought to trial at all,..."

S: "In the first place."

R: "...in the first place, or since...in this investigation or in philosophy,..."

S: I would translate "nor in philosophizing..." Socrates does something in addition to philosophizing. We do not yet know what it is. Nor do we know, for that matter, what philosophizing is, and that's probably the reason why we do not know what this other ingredient is. Yes?

R: "...and if you are caught doing so...never give up philosophy..."

S: Well, "I shall never cease philosophizing." This is an adaptation from a verse of Euripides in his Heracles, where the chorus says, "I shall never cease worshipping the Muses," and where the general view is that this is of course Euripides speaking now through the chorus because the chorus were simple minded people who were not likely to worship the Muses. Be that as it may. Now let us stop here and see what this means. Socrates would obey the god rather than the Athenians. That's elementary. And therefore--but now we come to the interesting consequence which not everyone would have drawn--therefore he would disobey an Athenian law forbidding philosophizing. That's important. Because what he speaks about here is without using the word "law," he speaks in fact about a

legal prohibition against philosophizing. Now whether there was at that time a law in force which by implication forbade philosophizing, that is impossible to say, because it depends on whether philosophizing is thought to be compatible with believing in the existence of the gods worshipped by the city. According to a very common view we have seen from the Apology, philosophizing was thought to be incompatible with believing in the existence of the god of the city, and therefore by implication philosophy was a capital crime of impiety. Another point which we must keep in mind also with a view to the Crito, where Socrates seems to speak in favor of unqualified obedience to the law, Socrates is not unqualifiedly in favor of obeying the laws. For example, such a law, like the one forbidding philosophizing, he would not obey under any circumstances.

Now this whole question...I think we must stop here. This whole question... Here we are at a crucial point, and I would like to make only this remark. This relation not only of this Athenian democracy in a state of great nervousness in the year 399, but the polis altogether, has a complicated relation...had a complicated relation to philosophy. And the simplest proof of this is the fact that when Plato builds up the best possible regime in the Republic, this best possible regime is possible only if it is based on the noble lie. And one can argue as follows: If even the best regime requires a lie as its foundation, all the more so the imperfect regimes. And these two lies...Noble lies of the Republic are these two: First you have to read the passage in Alc. I can give you only the crude results. The transformation of the earth into the land, which means in the practically important /conclusion/ that not all human beings, children of the earth, but all the children of the soil, of the fatherland, are brothers. This is the first massive point, the absolutization, as we can say, with a barbaric expression, of the individual state. And the second point is what we can call the sanctification of the established regime, declaring it to be beyond any reasonable doubt, beyond any rational criticism. Now these two crucial limitations, incompatible with philosophy, are of the essence of the city. Therefore there is a disproportion which can lead at all times--happily very rarely--to actual conflict between the philosophizing man and the city. And from here we understand the beginnings of modernity in the simplest manner, that what happened since the 17th century, 18th century is the emergence of the view that society in perfect harmony with philosophy, in essential harmony with philosophy, is possible. Namely, by two things: If the whole citizen body is enlightened by philosophy, it will no longer resent philosophy. So enlightenment is the crucial thing. The second point. The end of the philosopher, according to Socrates, radically differs from the end of the non-philosopher. We will find a very strong statement to this effect in the Crito. The end of the philosopher, we may say, using now a non-Socratic term, is understanding, contemplation as such. And the end of the non-philosopher is all kinds of things, noble or less noble, but surely not contemplation. And now what comes to the fore in the 17th century is the view that the end of the philosophers and the ends of the non-philosophers can be identified in so far as the philosopher will use his philosophizing for furthering the ends of the non-philosopher. In simple terms, knowledge, science for the sake of power--of power, meaning power of improving the lot of men. By these two steps which we can indicate by the abbreviations enlightenment and technology. The harmony between philosophy and society, as we now say, was achieved to such an extent that especially in the more favored countries, like the United States, but to some extent even in such countries like Germany, it is no longer intelligent that there ever was a fundamental conflict between philosophy and the polis.

Now we have read again a rather lengthy section of the Apology, and therefore we must try to have some discussion today, if this is regarded as useful or desirable. Now I begin again with a general observation. Studying a work of Plato means undergoing a training in thinking, in philosophizing. In other words it is not an attempt to get information; there are other books for this purpose. Now philosophy has means the quest for knowledge of the whole, all things, not less. But to know the whole means to know all its parts. Hence the whole process of philosophizing consists in a movement back and forth between the whole and the parts. Considering every detail, linking it up with the whole, and then descending from the whole to the detail in question. Understanding the detail in the light of the whole. This is what we are trying to do when reading the Apology, and in this we train ourselves for the study, if one may say so, of worthier subjects, not merely the thought of Plato, but the truth. Now this, if one can call that with an improper word, what I just sketched, the epistemology of Plato, this is nothing peculiar to Plato but it is what we do all the time. I take a very obvious subject in a political science class, say, state politics as the subject. Everyone who studies that, even the first--and precisely the originator of this field--starts of course from the whole, state politics, meaning from some awareness of the whole. Even if one seemingly begins with one special detail--say, "Republican politics in the state of Illinois, 1966 November"--if one would not start from the whole one could not select the detail in question as belonging to "state politics." I mean in this very simple, common-sensical sense must it be understood first what the Platonic procedure is.

Now at the end of our last meeting I referred to what one can call the quarrel--the quarrel--within political philosophy. The problems are in a manner the same in all times. For example, here the possible injustice of laws. But the contexts in which they appear differ in different epochs. And this difference is as important as the agreements. Now no change is as fundamental as that which separates modern political philosophy from classical political philosophy. This difference is indeed not visible at every point, and not to every eye. But reduced to the most simple formula the difference is this: Classical political philosophy denies, whereas modern political philosophy asserts the possibility of a rational society, or of an unqualifiedly just society to be established and preserved by men's own powers alone. The doctrine which is today sometimes called--I think in introductory lectures to politics--which is there called the classical theory of democracy, which is roughly that of John Stuart Mill, is an example of what I mean by the doctrine of a rational, a perfectly just society, with the easy allowance that it is not quite perfect now but there is a sure way of making it ever more just. In passing I remark that social science as now usually understood is a product of the disintegration of modern political philosophy, and therefore not intelligible by itself. You must have some understanding of modern political philosophy if you want to understand modern, present day social science.

Now as a proof that classical political philosophy is radically different in this decisive respect from modern political philosophy, I give now one example. And that is Aristotle's doctrine of slavery. I believe one can say that part of Aristotle's political teaching which is most famous, or rather notorious,...the most famous, or rather notorious part of Aristotle's teaching. As many of you will know that Aristotle says that slavery is just if the men enslaved are by nature slaves. And that means if they are not able to take care of themselves, and have

to have someone who guides them. You can say in the most desirable case, a very strong moron--a moron, you know, who would get drunk all the time, would fall into ditches all the time, has to be someone around. But if someone is around he can be useful, for example, carrying heavy burdens, trees, and so on and so on. Now when Aristotle discusses in the seventh book of the same Politics the subject of slavery in a just society, he says that the slaves must be given the hope of emancipation, because otherwise they would be dissatisfied with their lot. Now it is obvious that slaves who can be emancipated are not the natural slaves of whom he spoke in Book one. If one brings these opposite statements together, one arrives at this suggestion: that Aristotle was aware of the fact that the perfectly just...the man enslaved perfectly justly would not fill the requirement, in other words, they wouldn't be good enough as slaves; therefore a concession had to be made to this need, and therefore you were compelled also to enslave people who were not by nature slaves, i.e., a certain ingredient of injustice. That Aristotle doesn't stress this point in this way goes without saying, because this is not something...a very pleasant thing to talk about.

Now generally speaking we may say the peculiar teaching of the classics [in this sense? in this is?] there is a disproportion between reason and the city. This disproportion is also the theme of the work we are reading now. But in the Apology this is brought out in a very subdued manner, most visibly as follows: If the Athenians were to forbid philosophizing, Socrates would not obey that law. So this is in other words only a contingency, not a necessity. But, according to the view accepted by the many, by what people now would call public opinion, and by the view underlying the indictment of Socrates, philosophy as such does not recognize the gods recognized by the city, and therefore there is an essential conflict between philosophy and the city, and does not depend on any particular law which the Athenians might or might not have established. The last word of the Apology, in the original, is the word "God." The only Platonic work ending with "God." There is only one Platonic work opening with the word "God," and this is the Laws. And I believe that there is a connection between the Apology and the Laws, as follows: In the tenth book of the Laws, Plato lays down the principles in which all citizens of a good polis must believe--the existence of God, or gods; that they exercise providence for man, and that they cannot be bribed by sacrifice or prayers. Now in more recent times in our age Plato has been accused of lack of liberalism that he establishes a state religion, a certain fixed belief. This is not the way to look at it, it seems to me. The key point is this: the belief which Plato demands of the citizens of a good city is the belief in the gods who can be known by human reason, whose existence and attributes can be demonstrated by human reason. We can say Plato replaces the gods worshipped by the city in the ordinary sense, the Olympian gods, by the cosmic gods. Now this implies at least this much, that prior to the foundation of that just city, the foundation effected in speech in the laws, there was that conflict between the city and philosophy of which I spoke.

Now to come back to the Apology proper. Its general character which strikes everyone is this, that it presents a deadly serious conflict. Whether that conflict is necessary or essential or accidental is another matter. A deadly serious conflict. What does deadly serious mean? Most literally, threatening death. That is of course the case here. Now when we speak of these matters in such terms, we imply death is a very great evil, and therefore when we say "deadly sins" this is implied. Generally speaking, and this is of course justified to some extent by the

practice of most penal codes according to which capital punishment is the gravest punishment and punishment is meant to inflict an evil, and therefore capital punishment--the gravest evil, death the gravest evil. But as we have seen Socrates questions this very view of death for the simple reason we don't know enough, or he doesn't know enough about what will come after death so that he cannot say that death is the greatest evil. So what is deadly serious is then for Socrates not the most serious, the unqualifiedly serious. And from here we can understand that the Apology is at the same time deadly serious and--what seems to be the radical opposite--high comedy. This fact is in a way generally admitted, but at the same time obfuscated by the people who speak of Socrates' irony. When you read, for example, Burnet's commentary we find many references to Socrates' irony. But what Burnet and quite a few others do not see is that Socrates' irony is all pervasive; I mean it is not only there where it hits you over the head like a ton of bricks, say, when he would say of a very ugly man, to take an un-Socratic example, that he is a very beautiful man, this is an irony which is proper for children. Socrates' irony is subtle and therefore all-pervasive.

Now the reason why The Apology of Socrates is bound to be radically ironical is supplied to us, as I have mentioned before, in the Gorgias, where Socrates discusses the situation in which he would be when accused before the demos of Athens. He would be in the situation of a physician...in which a physician finds himself when accused before children of baring them, and the accuser would be, naturally, the candy dealer who gives them the things which the kids like. How could a man in such a situation make clear to the tribunal what the situation is? He would have to adapt himself to the capacity of the tribunal. This adapting oneself to the capacity of someone less considerate, thoughtful, intelligent than oneself, that is one crucial meaning of the word "irony," which has been somewhat forgotten on the basis of the modern sophistications of irony.

Now Socrates' refutation of Meletus, which we read last time, was introduced by Socrates' changing of the wording of the indictment. And the refutation is based on that change in the wording of the indictment. That makes it so very important. The key point is the change is the following: I use now first the Greek words, and try then to state it without the use of Greek words. Whereas Meletus had said, in the authentic wording, that Socrates does not believe in the gods of the city but introduces demonic things that are new, Socrates drops that word "introducing," eisegomenos, and thus in fact replaces "introducing" by "believing in." So that he grants then, after the Socratic correction or falsification or whatever you wish to call it, Socrates commits a crime by not believing in the gods of the city but believing in other demonic things which are new. Now and then of course on the basis of that it is very easy to show for Socrates that if Socrates believes in demonic things he believes in gods, because demonic things are not possible if there are not demons and demons are not possible if there are no gods. That's easy. Yes. Now and to prove, as it were, that this is so, Plato makes Socrates replace the word "believing in," noizein in Greek, by another Greek word for "believing," hegeisthai, which is, however, the grammatical root of that word, "leading in," "introducing," which he had dropped. Good.

Now we had begun at the end of the last meeting to discuss the last part of Socrates' defense proper. That last part we may say is a defense of Socrates against Meletus, but not with a view to Meletus, but with a view to the judges. In the refutation of Meletus, the explicit refutation, he spoke with a view to Meletus,

es is shown most obviously by the fact that it is partly a dialogue between Socrates and Meletus. But now it is not with a view to Meletus but with a view to the jury. Apart from this the meaning of that last part of the defense is not clear. Socrates lays the greatest stress on the principle or maxim that to act unjustly or disgracefully is much worse than to die, or to engage in a death-bringing, or at any rate dangerous pursuit. From this maxim he concludes that the most unjust and disgraceful thing is to disobey the gods' or a god's command. Such a command must be obeyed more than anything else, including human laws. We are more or less at this point. And we had to wonder why Socrates engages here at the beginning of this section in a polemic against an individual whom we called, with the help of one of you, a lout, meaning a man who doesn't see the...who doesn't see that there are things which are disgraceful [with a slight overstatement?]. I think we have to go on more or less where we stopped last time. 29d 2. "If, as I said, you would let me go under this condition, namely, that I will no longer philosophize, then I would..."

R: "...Men of Athens, I respect...and the perfection of your soul?"

S: Let us stop here. And for phronesis, for being sensible, and for truth, and so that your soul may be as good as possible. And I think one can translate, paraphrase, this last expression by saying "virtue," although it is of course important that Socrates doesn't. Socrates formulates now the sound principle, the maxim which he follows in his life, in the most general manner. Man's overriding concern must be with being sensible, with truth, and with virtue. Obedience to the god may be supposed to be a part of this, perhaps of virtue, namely, piety. The tri-partition reminds of a well known tri-partition, a tri-partition well known from Aristotle—practical wisdom, theoretical wisdom, and moral virtue. These are not Platonic distinctions. How Socrates understands the tri-partition we cannot say on the basis of the passage before us, but the purport of this remark—you will see there is no reference to philosophy here, only this general reference to truth, which may be a reference, but it is not obvious. Let us go on here.

R: "And if any of you argues the point,...for what is of less worth."

S: Let us stop here. Now the emphasis is now entirely on virtue; this complicated triad is now dropped. The question is, has virtue been absorbed, has virtue absorbed the two other items—meaning, being sensible or truth? Yet there is now an almost explicit link-up of Socrates' universal maxim with his examination of the Athenians, although that examination is no longer clearly an examination of them in regard to wisdom. Wisdom doesn't occur...he speaks here only of virtue. Socrates admits the possibility that there are Athenians who possess virtue, as you see here, whereas he does not admit the possibility that there are Athenians (including himself, of course) who possess wisdom, as he had stated very strongly before. He has spoken of Athens...of the wisdom of Athens in d 8, but he said there that Athens is famous, or renowned for her wisdom, and this of course does not mean that the renown is justified. In fact it is a bitter joke, on the basis of what we have heard before, that Athens should be renowned for her wisdom and we have seen how Athens looked when examined by Socrates. Yes. Now let me see. And we go on from this point. By the way, if you have any points...perhaps we'll finish first the next section, this section.

R: "This I shall do to whomever I meet,...nearly related to me,"

S: By descent, related in this strict sense.

R: "For know that the god commands me...or even so much..."

S: "Persons" is of course "bodies." You know, when you think of the meaning "person"--personality, isn't it somewhat strange? So let us say "bodies."

R: "...and I tell you that virtue does not...he says what is untrue."

S: Well literally "he says nothing," just not at all. Yes.

R: "Therefore I say to you,...to die many times over."

S: Yes. Now Socrates completes now the transition which started before in 29d 6, ff. from philosophizing, whatever that may mean, to his teaching, his admonishing men to be virtuous. This admonition is based on knowledge, presupposes that knowledge, namely, on the knowledge that virtue is by far superior to money and all other good things, apart from virtue. So this is another side, which we have not seen before. This knowledge includes some reasoning. In other words, Socrates doesn't say generally, "Be good," with an exclamation mark. He gives a reason for that. And the reason is here indicated in b 2-4: "Virtue doesn't come out of money, but out of virtue comes money," and so on and so on. Now this thought...Burnet gives here a note which I think I might read to you, a note on 30b 3. "We must certainly not render 'from virtue comes money.' This is a case where interlaced order (of the Greek words) may seriously mislead." He translates, "It is goodness that makes money and everything else good for men." That is indeed a possible translation. And he makes the point that Socrates was now in ten-thousand fold poverty, he could hardly recommend virtue as a good investment. That is surely true. But that doesn't mean that Socrates...that doesn't settle the issue because when you read Plato's Laws, BookOne, 631b-c, you will see that here the same thought is expressed without any possibility of explaining differently. But I have it here; I can read it to you. I will just read it to you. "The laws of Crete, of the Cretans, are rightly held in high repute, for they are true laws inasmuch as they effect the wellbeing of those who use them by supplying all things that are good. Now goods are of two kind, human and divine. And the human goods are dependent on the divine. And he who receives the greater acquires also the less, or else he is bereft of both. The lesser goods are those of which health ranks first, beauty the second, the third is strength, and the fourth is wealth. And wisdom, in turn, has first place among the goods that are divine, temperance of soul comes second, then courage, and finally justice...courage, justice..." Yes. Good. If you have the divine goods, the virtues, you have by this very fact also the human goods--health and wealth--which of course runs counter to ordinary experience. But there is some deeper reason for that, and I think we can, if not fashion that reason, although see the necessity of looking for it, from the following passage of the Gospel of St. Matthew, Chapter 6, verses 31, ff.: "Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." That is fundamentally the point which Socrates makes. And whether Socrates

makes it in the spirit of the Bible is another matter. But there is no negligible reason, to put it mildly, for making this assertion which at first glance seemed to be contradicted by experience.

Now the point which is more immediately important is this: The knowledge of which Socrates makes use when admonishing his fellow citizens does not include an answer to the Socratic question, or the raising of it; namely the question, what is virtue? There is nothing of this kind here. He presupposes that everyone knows what virtue is, of course, and then he says, "Exercise virtue," and gives some reasons why they should do it because in a way of course it is true that virtue leads to money. Take a fellow who earns millions from his father, and lacks completely self-restraint, orderliness, forethought for the next day, and so on. He would surely get rid of his fortune in a very short time. So there is some common-sensical relation between virtue and money there, but of course on a very low level. But we do not know on what level Socrates sometimes spoke to what kind of people. So to repeat this point, the question for which Socrates was so famous, that he raised the question, what is virtue?, that virtue which we all praise so highly and of which we think so highly and of which we speak so frequently. He traces his activity, which does not include the raising of this question, his activity of urging people toward virtue, to a god, to the god. Now with what right? The god is here the god in Delphi. And the god in Delphi said, "No one is wiser than Socrates," or Socrates is the wisest of human beings. Now is virtue identical with being sensible, with phronesis, and does being sensible consist above all in knowledge of one's ignorance? In that case of course the god, by making Socrates discover his and the others' ignorance, making them know their ignorance, would make them virtuous. And one could perhaps say that what Socrates says about one virtue--courage before--entitles us to say that courage is knowledge of one's ignorance regarding the things in Hades. You remember we discussed this last time. We fear death because we are sure that what expects us after death is simply terrible. But we do not know what will happen after death, and therefore this is a rash act. However we have seen also last time that such ignorance of the things in Hades does not take care of fear of death, because precisely our ignorance makes us apprehensive. And then try to interpret moderation regarding sensual pleasures in terms of knowledge of ignorance. I believe you would get into some difficulties. For example, don't overeat because... what do you not know there? Of what are you ignorant if saying to yourself or to someone else, don't overeat? I think that wouldn't work out.

Now in order to understand the sequel to which we turn now, let us re-read b 8 - c 1.

B: "...but if anyone asserts that I say other...for know that if you kill me,..."

S: No, wait; let us stop here. Now the transition. Socrates has in a way talked what he said before. And he promises now to talk bigger still; therefore he expects them to shout. Again I would like to see what Burnet says here. Here he says...he translates here the word...I do not know now how he does translate it. At the first line, "Don't make a disturbance, you Athenians, but..." How does he go on?

R: "...continue to do what I asked of you,..."

S: Burnet translates it more literally, "Pray abide by what I have asked you for..." The proper use of this word, with the dative is of abiding by an agreement, promise, or covenant. Here it means "the promise I asked you to make," Now Socrates has indeed asked them to make...to be quiet on two former occasions; in 17b 1, when he asked them ...is it in 17b 1? No, I think it is c 1. There he speaks of the fact that they should not resent it, if he didn't speak as people ordinarily speak in law courts, because of his lack of experience. And on the other occasion, in 20e 4, when he asked them not to make a disturbance, he refers to the story of Delphi, which follows immediately. Now you see I give this little example, I emphasize it, because it shows again that Socrates does not simply reproduce the first statement, that he always changes it. Now he makes general, or universal, what originally was said only with a view to special cases. Now let us see. Yes. Let us go on.

R: "For know that if you kill me,...for I believe it is not God's will that a better man be injured by a worse."

S: That is, of course, a bit too strong. "For I do not think that it is right or meet." There is nothing of God here. "That the better man be harmed by the worse one." Yes.

R: "He might, however, perhaps kill me...killing a man unjustly."

S: No, "trying to kill a man unjustly."

R: "And so, men of Athens,...upon you everywhere the whole day long."

S: Let us stop here. Now this is then the reason why Socrates' life, not of great worth to him, is of infinite worth, so to speak, to the city of Athens. Meletus and Anytus could not harm Socrates, for...and the reason given is that Socrates thinks--think in the loose sense of the word, like Latin puto, or something--that it would not be right or meet that they would harm him. This term, which I translate "right or meet", was used before in 21b 6 when he spoke of the god's Oracle, and he said "it is not right or meet for the god to lie;" he did not say the god cannot lie. This word, which I translate by "think" in the crude sense of the word where it doesn't have the severe meaning. This word, oiesthai in Greek, occurs quite frequently in this connection, has a density. But this is minor, compared with the main point here, especially toward the end of this passage. Here this is the sole source for this well known image of Socrates as an Uncle Sam--you know the war-time posters, "I want you," pointing at you--who does nothing but buttonholing every Athenian he meets, "Did you take care of becoming virtuous today? Did you do your good deed today," as it were? You remember, that is very different from what he did when examining the Athenians on the basis of the Delphic Oracle. Because there he examined everyone whom he believed to be wise. This is a finite job. Laughter But as he does here, everyone, the whole day, everywhere--it couldn't be stated more emphatically. Here it would appear there is no examination of people supposed to be wise where it would be worthwhile, but an admonishing of everyone with a view not to wisdom, but to virtue in the simple, popular sense of the word, where knowledge of what virtue is is simply presupposed. Now this passage of course shows us with particular clarity the great difference between Socrates' own presentation of himself--well, it is of course also Plato's

presentation of Socrates' presentation of himself--and Plato's presentation of Socrates in the dialogue proper. There we do not find that Socrates is jumping at every passerby with this question. But especially striking, there is a great difference between what we may call voluntary dialogues and involuntary dialogues, dialogues which Socrates seeks, is eager for, and those in which he engages only because as a public man he cannot possibly avoid them. And he seeks the conversation with the promising people, and he avoids the conversation, or he willingly engages in conversation with non-promising people. So that's an entirely different picture than this, but this has caught the fancy of most biographers, especially the more popular ones.

Now there is a point which Burnet makes, which was brought out by the translation. The comparison with the gadfly, and Burnet points out, I think as this translator [admitted? omitted?]--"settling on every part of you," you know, as a gadfly, "the whole day." "Everyone," "on every part of you." This makes the simile of course the more ludicrous, but I think it is meant to be ludicrous, and therefore we should translate accordingly. Do you see? I don't have to labor that point I trust. Good. Yes. Now I think we'll go on here.

R: "Such another is not likely to come...and might slap me,..."

S: "Slap" meaning like a fly.

R: "...as Anytus advisee, and easily kill me;...someone else to sting you."

S: Let us stop here one moment. Now according to this presentation the Athenians regard sleep as the most desirable state. Well, in a metaphoric sense it is of course easy to understand because all of us, to more or less degree, loathe to...dislike intellectual exertions. And not engaging in intellectual exertion means, of course, to be intellectually asleep, and to be drowsy. But he simply implies here that they regard sleep as the most desirable state. Is there anyone among you who has read the whole Apology and is reminded by this passage of another passage?

Fielding: When he discusses what death may be like. S: I beg your pardon? Fielding: When he discusses what death may be like. S: Can you speak a little bit louder and explain it to the class? F: I believe he says toward the end of the dialogue that death may be one of two things: either a very long sleep in which we do not dream, the most pleasant thing imaginable...

S: Yes. So in other words...We will take it up when we come to that passage, but I think I should mention it already now. This view, that thoughtlessness, complete thoughtlessness, would be...is a pleasant state, a desirable state, is adopted by Socrates himself in a final speech in hC-c-a. Yes. Yes?

R: "And that I am, as I say,...the neglect of my concerns all these years,..."

S: "Also of my domestic affairs." Good.

R: "...but I am always busy in your interest,...to care for virtue:..."

S: Now let us stop here one moment. For so many years, Socrates did nothing

but your things, [givas Greek phrase here, apparently], he neglected his own things. The question is, for how many years? Well, I would suggest since the Delphic Oracle, because that was apparently the thing which made...induced Socrates to become so different from his fellow citizens. Yes?

R: "...now that is not like human conduct...would be some sense in it..."

S: So the fact that Socrates does not derive any monetary benefit from his activity, and hence that his activity does not make sense--it's not reasonable to do something when you get no money--is a proof that his activity is due to the god. Yes?

R: "...but now you yourselves see...namely, my poverty."

S: Yes. He boasts very much of his poverty. Now he speaks here they have not gone to that extreme of impudence to say that Socrates earned money through his activity, and the extreme of impudence would show itself in their producing a witness to this effect. This forces us to raise the question, did the accusers produce witnesses for their other charges? Well we can only say Socrates is absolutely silent about that, and his silence can be interpreted in very different ways. But it could be; this possibility has of course to be considered. Now here we may stop for a moment and see whether there are any points which you would like to raise. You must have noticed that a very different Socrates is now visible from the one we saw first, the one who went around cross-examining everyone and tried to make him aware of his ignorance, and the other Socrates who admonishes everyone to be virtuous by such homely and common sensical arguments, of which he gave a specimen, and presupposing, therefore, that he and the addressees know what virtue is, are not ignorant in [the important respect] is a very striking change. And Socrates now completely...a man living in the open all the time, as I put it, buttonholing everyone with this simple question, and so that...Yes. And he doesn't say a word here, by the way, I forgot to mention that but I ought to have mentioned, he doesn't say a word to this effect that this making a nuisance of himself by buttonholing everyone made him hated. I forgot that entirely. You see the trouble is one sometimes doesn't see the most obvious things. And whereas Delphic activity, the post-Delphic activity, examining, testing everyone whether he does not pretend to be wise while not being wise, that naturally made him hated. But such a man who would do that I think would be regarded as a nuisance and funny, and would not become an object of hatred. Good. Now, yes? (Will you open a window, please?)

Q: The original charge against Socrates was that he introduced different gods into the city. Socrates changed this charge to say that he believed in different gods, and he refuted that. Now the original charge said...charged Socrates with an action that he couldn't do alone, that involved other people, introducing gods.

S: Not necessarily. No. That I didn't say. I mean then you must take it quite literally, as Xenophon takes it, by not speaking of eisagelsthai--leading in--but eispherein [ep?], carrying in, as it were idols. But if they are light, I don't see why a single man couldn't even carry in idols. [Laughter] But [let us?] assume they are big ones, then he would need the help of other people.

Q: Well my point was going to hinge on that, that the city was more concerned not with what Socrates believed but with what he taught, and that the charge was

actually that he was teaching different gods than the city believed in. He broke apart this charge into two points, and said, "Well if I teach them I have to believe in them, and I have to believe in something the city doesn't like. But in fact I do believe in gods." And second that he now defends his teaching. At this point he's saying that "you have to agree with me that it is necessary for me to teach this." Indirectly he's answering the original charge against him.

S: Can you show that I mean I indicated how one could say that. Virtue is all-inclusive, includes piety, and piety includes--but here there is already a question--includes worship of and belief in the gods as worshipped by the city of Athens. I'm willing to grant that, although it is not self-evident. This is a way in which one could make it up, but there is no explicit reference to that. The only thing which Socrates does is a tacit reference to his piety by saying, "What I do I do by the command of the god." And to do what the god tells a man to do is a sign of piety. That is the connection. Yes?

Shulsky: You mentioned at the beginning of the class that in the tenth book of the Laws Plato refers to a city in which people would believe only those gods that are evident / through? / the reason, by reasoning. S: Yes. Shulsky: And so this would mean that at least as far as this question is concerned, Plato envisioned the possibility of a rational city, a rational political order.

S: Yes. Yes, but the question is of course to what extent did he regard the polis...or the city of the Laws as possible. Up to this point you are perfectly right. In itself, I would say it. Up to this point.

Bruell: In connection with that, you made...

S: By the way, formally--excuse me--what you say is also true of the Republic. The Republic presents the most perfect polis, the just--simply just--polis. And therefore you can say here you have the perfect harmony between reason and the city. And then it needs some argument and some penetration, some entering into the subject, in order to see that this is not possible. So the best city of the Laws is of questionable justice in the light of the truly just city of the Republic. That I should have answered. That one can easily show, I think. It is explicitly said that this best city of the Laws is arrived at by deviating from the sacred line, namely, absolute communism / and so on? /. So I granted in a way too much. Yes.

Bruell: That answers my question. Because you...in your opening statement when you said that classical political philosophy denies that a completely rational or perfectly just society can come into existence purely by human means, but is that last phrase required? I mean would the same...

S: It is required in order to see the difference between the Biblical notion of the kingdom of God and...after all, kingdom of god, it's also originally a political thing. And what the subject of classical or modern political philosophy as such is. That's the reason. And there is an agreement here between the classics and the Bible, in so far as they in fact deny--both--the possibility of a perfect society, the kingdom of God, coming into being by the human means alone.

Bruell: In other words, it's not a question of chance.

S: So, well, from the Biblical point of view there is no chance to speak of and surely not as regards the being or non-being of the kingdom of God.

Bruell: But from the point of view of classical political philosophy, "by human means" doesn't mean to leave open the possibility of...

S: Oh I did not think...I see now. I did not think of that. This surely is true. That is true, but the question is whether that best regime which could come into being under very favorable circumstances, by chance, whether that is unqualifiedly just. I did not think of the chance question.

Q: When we were talking about Socrates...Well, who of the audience, of the Athenians there, would know what Socrates had spoken, and this was early in the? an earlier? class? We said that Socrates actually taught or held his dialogues away from the marketplace, that in the marketplace...the knowledge the people in the arena there would have of what Socrates said was limited most likely to the marketplace. And there he questioned people to find out who was wise. Now does what Socrates say that he does here--serves as the gadfly of the city--change that? Or is that...?

S: In what sense? In other words, when he says that this [worked?] everywhere, which is very ambiguous, which can mean at every part of the body in the sense of the simile, or it can mean at every place, and therefore of course also the marketplace.

Q: But what he is doing everywhere is different than simply exposing those who think they are wise, or is that...

S: That is the point which I tried to make. This is somehow brought into oblivion in favor of something else, namely this admonishing to virtue which as such has no relation to pointing out...or to make men aware of their ignorance. I mean those of you who have ever read Xenophon's *Memorabilia* will know quite a few of these admonitions of Socrates to virtue, especially I believe Book One, chapter 3, if my memory doesn't escape me. It's a beautiful example where Socrates, as it were, speaks on the stump, addresses a multitude of people, and tells them on admonition to self control by raising such questions: Would you entrust your son for education and your daughter for watching (you see this insidious distinction) [laughter]...would you entrust your son for education and your daughter for watching to a man who lacks self control? And so on and so on.

there is not a single raising of a question What is? here, but only admonition to this particular virtue. And other things, where he makes clear, for example, to his son, who was displeased with his notorious mother, Xanthippe, because she nagged him so much. And he convinces him by a very beautiful argument that it is unreasonable of him to be displeased with his mother. This is again... you know, leading up to virtue without any attempt to make him wiser in any precise sense of the term. Here the argument, by the way, is also very amusing. He says when he complains about the terrible things she does to him, he says, asks him, "Does she bite you?" And he says, "No! But she says--she says--terrible things, which no one can bear." And then he says, Socrates says to his son, "Did you ever go to the theater?" "Yes." "Did you hear what terrible things the actors say to each other?" "Yes. But they don't mean it." [laughter] Socrates: "But

does your mother mean it?" [Laughter] You see the whole argument turns around the ambiguity of "meaning," meaning something. So this is...And any of these stories of Xenophon would be a good example of what this admonition to virtue means, and which is of course something very good and helpful and praiseworthy, but it is not surely not that Delphic activity of which he had spoken before. Yes?

Fielding: At 30b, Socrates says that--or perhaps concedes--that, "If by saying these things I corrupt the youth, these things must be injuries." Would you say some more about whether that indeed is the case? Whether that is indeed the case?

S: Now, that if...In other words [is this what you mean?], by saying not out of money...virtue doesn't come out of money but out of virtue does money come, and so on. These are the things which Socrates says, and therefore if he is accused of corrupting the young it can only refer to this statement or statements of a similar kind. That's the point which you make. Well, what do you say? Socrates makes no other statements, in other words, except to praise virtue as the root of all good things. And in what sense could he conceivably say this is corrupting the young?

Fielding: Well he wouldn't but it is possible that Athens might.

S: Why could Athens say it? I would say on the contrary, so to speak the only man who could regard this possible as corrupting the young would be Socrates, in so far as the question What is virtue? is not raised, and therefore the state of being asleep, of drowsiness, is continued.

Fielding: But isn't it possible that Athens doesn't really care for virtue? I mean that the accusation Socrates...

S: I would assume that Athens had a reasonable percentage of criminals and so on, but the average Athenian was as much interested in children obeying their parents, in brothers living in amity, and in friends being truly friends and not parasites or what not. No, I think there is no reason to question that. The situation becomes somewhat different when you go over from this ordinary, domestic situations, as it were, to the political situations. For example, whether in a given war a gross injustice against the enemy might be...might not be advisable. Think of the story of Mitylene, you know? When Cleon wanted to have this city punished with extermination because they had broken an alliance with Athens. and for some time the majority was in favor of that beastly act, but...there it had become serious. But as people say, and it is a very common saying, of a candidate running for office, he is against sin. This is relatively simple, you know, to agree to these matters. It is another matter not to sin. But when the sin becomes highly profitable, at least at first glance, for the commonwealth as a whole, then opinions differ already in a grave way. Do you see my point? But this is not here under discussion. Here is the point only that Socrates says...that confirms only what I said before. Socrates corrupts the young. What's the basis for that? People make this charge. Originally it was that he debunks the respected people and he uses young men to do that debunking by themselves, and that is still more obnoxious than the debunking done by Socrates. But here there is no longer any question of debunking. There is a question of admonishing to virtue, and only in

a subordinate way, when this man becomes aware that he has not sufficiently taken care of his virtue, that Socrates says "Well, mend that."

Fielding: But isn't this admonition or this admonition to virtue also a case of undermining parental authority on certain occasions?

S: In what sense? That Socrates usurps the role of a father or elder brother? Perhaps. I mean it is possible that a father is so eager to be the only one to give commands to his son that he would resent it; that's possible. But it would be different if he would undermine explicitly the authority of the father by debunking the claim of the father to be wise, would it not? This could come in. What you are driving at, I take it, is that there is not such a great difference, such a radical difference, between the two things that I have asserted. I admit that. But still, if you take the massive statements in the first case and the second case, the difference is nevertheless there. That there is a transition, a gradual transition, from, say, summer to winter, doesn't prove that there is no difference between summer and winter.

Fielding: But the fact that a transition has been made to the winter does not necessarily mean that the evils that were perpetrated in the summer are not perpetrated in the winter also.

S: Yes. Well then give me a better example, a better simile. But the thing that...two phenomena...That there are transitional phenomena between two things, that there are gradual differences of all kinds, does not do away with the essential difference. Because even if the two things come together, even if in a given case by admonishing to virtue he corrupts the young in the first sense, still this is a coincidence of two different things; it is not identical. Yes?

Q: When I read that maxim I thought it was corrupting because it contained the implication that virtue should be pursued for the sake of a reward and not for its own sake.

S: This is a good point that you make; that is of course what Socrates or Plato meant. But that shows you the level of this argument, of the Apology as a whole, and of this presentation of Socrates, that this issue is not raised. You know? That...There is in Socrates, in Plato and Xenophon, that strain which connects him somehow with what later on came to be called utilitarianism. Virtue is essentially for the sake of something moral. I don't know whether the utilitarians would put it this way but this is what they mean. And that is there. And on the other hand you have also especially in Plato, but also in Xenophon, the other view, that virtue must be chosen for its own sake. That's a very complicated story. But here the interesting thing in the Apology is that this is the only thing said, because the Apology is the only speech which Socrates addresses to the Athenians at large. All other conversations which Plato wrote are conversations between Socrates and an individual or a very few individuals. And the general view of Plato is that in a public speech addressed to many you must be, you cannot but be, much more crude than in a talk to, especially to selected individuals. That is...In other words, ordinary rhetoric is essentially inferior to what Plato calls dialectics, the art of conversing with one or a few. Yes, now there was someone there. You first.

Q: Don't we perhaps find an analogy here between

in

the Meno, where in the beginning of the Meno there is the attempt to attain knowledge of what is virtue which, when that fails, we see that Socrates was perhaps trying to, without explaining to meno what virtue was, to lead meno to some approximation of the virtuous life. Might not, in the course of his dealings with Athens, Socrates have developed... come to a similar development, in that beginning by trying to lead the Athenians to knowledge, and having... because, like Meno, they wouldn't come, to for the majority, the unpromising, the... to advocate, admonish then to virtue.

S: I couldn't follow you.

R: Is it that the Apology may be moving with respect to the Athenians as the dialogue Meno did with respect to meno. First you try to get virtue based on knowledge, and when that fails, you settle for exhortation.

S: Oh, I see. Yes. But I believe we mustn't forget there is this fundamental and obvious difference. That in the Meno the attempt is made to lead someone in that conversation to a better understanding, whereas here it is prescribed by the situation that Socrates must obey the law, and must defend himself. And therefore he must comply with the requirements of a defense. And this would seem to be a more natural key to the changes here.

Q: What I was saying is that this is not... just out of the Apology but in the course of Socrates' questioning in Athens from the time of the Oracle that the original impetus, his original attempt was through conversations to lead to virtue as he originally tried in the Meno, i.e., through knowledge, and that when this failed the majority of unpromising people, with them he resorted to admonitions, while...

S: That might be. There is other evidence for that. That might be. For example, take the Euthyphro, where Socrates first tries to go deeper into the question of piety. But then precisely because this man, Euthyphron to whom he talks, is not able to bear that and it would only harm him, he leads him back to the simple view--prayer and sacrifices, that's all, as prescribed by law. But here in this case the conversation with Euthyphron is not a voluntary conversation of Socrates; Euthyphron forces him into that conversation as you would see at the beginning. In other words, we must consider the difference between the way in which Socrates presents himself here with my exaggeration--Uncle Sam--with the way in which Plato presents him everywhere else, and in which there is no such going around in Athens and... The only two dialogues which have come down under the name of Plato to us which begin with Socratic buttonholing are the Minos and the Hipparchia [ap?], two short dialogues which today are generally regarded as spurious, and which both begin... Socrates asked a nameless man, "What is law?" in the one case, and in the other, "What is love of gain?" without any preparation, just as the one here. But here he does not admonish to virtue in the simple sense as presented here, but raises the typically Socratic What is? question. That's a different story. Now someone here had... Oh yes.

Q: You said last week, if I can change the subject, that while Socrates apparently subordinates the impiety charge to the charge of corruption, in fact he reduces the charge of corruption to the charge of impiety. S: Yes. Q: Would you suggest his reasons for that?

S: Well, that he in fact subordinates the corruption charge to the impiety charge is intelligible, because according...what they ultimately mean is that Socrates corrupts the youth exclusively by his impious teaching and not by immoral practices, and so on. Is this not...in fact. But why does he present the corruption charge as preceding the impiety charge? That was made quite clear. Because according to Socrates what distinguishes him from all other Athenians is his examining every Athenian who seems to be wise. And then his young companions initiate him, and these young companions are more resented by the victim than Socrates himself, and therefore they say Socrates corrupts the young. But when they are asked, "How? And by doing what, or teaching what?" then they say not the truth, of course, which would be unbearable for them, because they debunk as--"he makes the youth debunk us," but they fall back on a wholly spurious, fictitious reason, which they invent for the purpose, that he investigates the things aloft and beneath the earth and so on. And therefore the charge closest to what actually happened is the corruption charge.

Q: That's closest to what actually happened in Socrates' presentation.

S: Yes. Yes, yes.

Q: Whereas the fact that in the actual charge impiety is mentioned first and not corruption.

S: Sure. Well that is clear, because...Is it not so, that in the genesis, in the order of coming into being, of genesis, according to Socrates' presentation, the corruption charge precedes the impiety charge. But in the order of being, or of importance, the opposite is obviously true. Because if Socrates were to corrupt the young by improprieties, it would obviously not be a capital crime as it is if he corrupts the young by impiety. Yes.

Q: Is it possible that in describing what he's doing in terms of button-holing every Athenian, Socrates is trying to be sarcastic and that he is suggesting that since he somehow...since he's speaking to relatively simple minded people, he is putting his action and his mission in very simple minded terms?

S: Sure. Obviously. Q: It's a joke on his hearers in a sense. S: But...Exactly. In other words, take it quite without any malice or viciousness, that of course he does. But that exactly is the primary--or not the primary, but a meaning very close to the primary meaning of irony. I mean you know our present notion of irony stems from so-called romanticism and, by the way, [Kierkegaard?] plays some role here by his [doctor's dissertation?]. But the original meaning of irony is very simple. Irony means dissimulation, dissimulation. And therefore, of course, something bad. But it is a peculiar kind of dissimulation, namely, the dissimulation not of one's defects but of one's virtues. Understatements are untrue statements, obviously, but they are--understatements about oneself are--something decent. Good. One can say if it is a vice it is a graceful vice. But ultimately--I'm following now Aristotle first, because Aristotle is here...makes these elementary things clear--Aristotle says of the magnanimous man, the man who possesses...claiming high honors for himself while possessing...while deserving them; he says he is ironical toward the many. Now that doesn't mean that he has a despicable enjoyment of his superiority to others; that would make him despicable. But that he simply cannot reveal his worth as he sees it to the many without being...seeming

to be an unbearable boaster and booster, and therefore he will understate it, he will conceal it. Now but if virtue par excellence is wisdom, as we must always presuppose in the case of men like Plato and Aristotle, then of course irony would consist above all in concealing one's wisdom on the part of a wise man, in order not by obtruding his wisdom unnecessarily and unprofitably to hurt the feelings of less wise people. And there are, one can say, two ways in which Socrates does it, and the first is that he raises questions and doesn't answer them...you know? If you address a question to someone, you imply obviously that he knows the answer and you don't. Or another way is by being satisfied with answers with which he cannot be satisfied. I mean this sneering element which some people find in irony in the vulgar use, that is to be left out. That is in one sense true of the young people. When Socrates debunks a pompous ass, we have seen that before, this Socrates regards as his solemn duty. These young people find it funny and they enicker, probably. And that is forgivable because they are young. Good. I think if you don't mind...Keep your questions in your mind and tell me later.

Now first there was a question. One of you had a question. Who is it? He came to my office. Yes.

Q: I wanted you to clarify somewhat more for me why atheism is ^{the} truly serious charge of the two, in the light of the fact that whereas in the cross-examination of Meletus, Meletus agrees with Socrates in saying that atheism is the more fundamental charge, but in what immediately preceded, Socrates seems to tell us that atheism is only something that was charged because of the embarrassment of men who _{by the youth who had heard Socrates.}

S: Yes. There is no contradiction between the two things. According to Socrates' assertion the charge of atheism is baseless. Therefore he has to explain how it could arise. And then he tells the story of the Delphic Oracle and his examining the Athenians in regard to wisdom, his debunking these people, and especially the debunking of them by the young. And then these people getting angry, as people would, say Socrates corrupts the young. And then when they are asked, "But what does he do?" then they say, "Well, he is an atheist; he teaches atheism." Because they would not say, of course, that "he debunks us, and these young people debunk us." That is not a reason which people would give. And then they say something which is a very grave matter, that Socrates doesn't recognize the gods of the polis, of the city. And naturally this is in weight the most important charge, more important than corruption. Because someone might corrupt the young in a more trivial sense, and then it wouldn't be a capital crime. It becomes a capital crime by being connected with the impiety charge. There is no difficulty in that. It all turns around the question, Is the charge against Socrates as baseless as it seems to be? One can state this difficulty as follows: Socrates is accused of not acknowledging the gods of the city. Does he ever refute that charge? Does he refute that charge? He refutes the charge that he does not acknowledge gods in general, but he does this only ad hominem, because the same Meletus had asserted that Socrates acknowledges daemonic things, and then Socrates proved basutifully you can't acknowledge demonic things if you do not acknowledge demons, and demons are the children of gods. And if you believe in demons, you believe in gods, just as a man who believes in mules believes in horses. You remember that? So the charge itself is never refuted by Socrates. Yes?

Q: Is it possible to prove that one believes in gods? Because can't any affirmation of faith be claimed to be a lie by the accuser?

S: Yes. That is a great difficulty, which led in a way to modern liberalism, that this is not subject to any law. But still in former times, as long as there were established religions in this sense, there were criteria, and a very simple one which is good enough is if someone says explicitly, "I do not believe in what you, the community as a whole, believes." Of course I mean it is thinkable that he believes it and out of some very strange reasons he says the opposite, perhaps because he wishes to become a martyr. That may be. But generally speaking this was thought to be good enough, just as today if someone says he is a Communist, he is generally believed that he is a Communist, and also will suffer from the consequences, even if he is not a Communist. But there are crazy people; that's possible. Good. Yes?

Q: That first...the first reaction to the debunking on the young people was that Socrates is an atheist; this idea got spread around...

S: Not the first; the first reaction is that Socrates corrupts the young, ...and the second reaction is...

Q: Yes. And then how does it proceed from there to the specific charge about the gods? Is there any kind of connection there, or is it...?

S: But what is the worst thing which a man could do to corrupt the young? I mean what could it be? [Meaning?] some homosexual improprieties? This was not quite—even now is of course not a capital crime in any sense, but it was much less so in Athens. But what thing with grave consequences could a man be accused of? The most massive thing and the gravest thing was of course impiety.

Q: Now what I'm wondering about is the difference between impiety in general, not believing in any gods, and the question about the gods of the city. Did they first of all think that he was just an atheist in itself, and then this later charge sort of drew from that because this is maybe more serious...?

S: Well you know how...this is the context: Socrates makes a trap for Meletus, and asks him, "Do you mean to say I do not believe in the gods of the city, but in other gods?" And in order to aggravate the matter Meletus says, "No, you don't believe in any god." And then Socrates says, "Look, but you said I believed in demonic things, and hence I believe in gods." So the issue of the gods of the city is avoided, and this is to say nothing of the more interesting thing, that Socrates changes the wording of the charge and thus establishes a basis for his rebuttal to Meletus which does not exist on the basis of the authentic wording of the charge. I have discussed this at some length. Yes?

Q: You asked the question, What would be the grave kind of corruption? and of course obviously teaching atheism is one. Couldn't another be educating men who become or are likely to become [parents?] and...?

S: Yes. This surely played also a role, but it does not come up here in Plato's...In Xenophon this is discussed at some length. But here it does not come up. [Next question inaudible?] Because I believe Plato wished to, in his great honesty, wished to make clear that the most serious issue, the most fundamental issue, is that between philosophy and the gods of the city. Surely Alcibiades' conduct and Critias' conduct, which are alluded to in the Apology, but developed at great length in Xenophon, Memorabilia, were there. In other words, some of these young people who surrounded Socrates proved to be more than good for nothing from the point of view of the respectable, law abiding citizen. And that of course reflected on Socrates' innocence; there is no question. The fact is that Plato doesn't make anything, to speak of, of that, whereas the atheism charge is underlined. Yes?

Q: Does it follow that if the philosopher does not debunk the Athenians in public, he will not be accused of impiety?

S: Well you see if a man sits at home and cultivates his garden and pays his taxes and goes to war, and so, and never talks about the things of the greatest concern to anybody, except "You are right," when someone tells him something, nothing will happen to him.

Q: But debunking the Athenians in public is hardly... S: It is not a legal point? ...Q: to discussing the greatest matters. S: No. Socrates doesn't say so, although he seems to present it at...but it creates hatred, doesn't it? I mean that is what Socrates asserts and quite plausibly. If someone goes around and debunks all the people who are looked up to by their contemporaries, he doesn't become...is not a likable fellow.

Q: Why is this implied in philosophy? In other words, why is there a necessary conflict between philosophy and the city that makes this ?

S: That is a long question, but I would like to say something. I have prepared a brief statement on the subject, and partly taking up some things which I said last time. Yes?

Q: You said that Socrates, or that Plato once made clear that the great issue between the philosopher and the city is with respect to impiety and not with respect to corruption. If that's the case I'm surprised that he changes the wording of the charge so that corruption...well, it seems that he would do this in all possible ways accepting the original wording of the charge where impiety came first. But he doesn't.

S: But is this necessary? Having given this account of the genesis of this charge. Debunking by the young. Socrates, corrupter of the young: Socrates, the impious man. From this point of view the first crime is of course corrupting the young. It comes first in time. But this doesn't...is not decisive because what is first in time is not necessarily first in rank, because the question arises, is raised by Socrates explicitly, "By doing what, by teaching what do I corrupt the young?" And then the answer is, "By teaching them not to acknowledge the gods of the city." So the corruption charge is reduced to the impiety charge. Is this so difficult to understand? That something may be prior in time and posterior in rank?

Q: Although in fact, maybe I am just excessively stupid, I didn't notice...

S: No, I didn't say that. [Laughter] And I did not mean it, either.

Q: I didn't notice until you pointed it out that corruption was reduced to impiety. I was struck by the more general statement that corruption seems to come first. And it seems to me there must be more people than just myself who were struck by that and not struck by...

S: Yes, I mean the corruption charge is as a whole, taken by itself, divorced from the impiety charge, more harmless. And therefore Xenophon in his Memorabilia devotes say four pages, I forgot the exact number, to the impiety charge, and say thirty pages to the corruption charge. Because the hot iron was the impiety charge, not the corruption charge. And, well, you see the point that Socrates was friendly at some with Alcibiades and Critias is not in itself a capital crime. I mean guilt by association doesn't go so far. You know? And then Socrates could say that he didn't learn from me to try to become a tyrant. And there would have been, I suppose, quite a few witnesses who would have borne that out. So now let us then continue.

The conflict between the city and philosophy is an essential conflict if the city is not possible without the gods of the city and philosophy is not compatible with recognizing those gods. Otherwise the conflict would be accidental. This problem does not exist in the modern liberal state with its freedom for religion, and in a manner, from religion. But this solution, supplied by the modern liberal state to the millennial problem is not properly understood if one does not understand the problem in its original form in the first place. In the case of Socrates or Plato, the conflict in question was solved in a manner in Plato's Laws. The last word of the Apology is "Gods;" the first word of the Laws is "God." The city of the Laws, described by Plato in the Laws, requires a recognition of the cosmic gods whose being can be demonstrated, as distinguished from the Olympian gods, whose being is known only by tradition. And this distinction between the cosmic and the Olympian gods is connected ultimately with the distinction between what is good and what is ancestral. The ordinary premise being the good is identical with the ancestral. But a little bit reflection suffices to show that this equation is not valid, although it is meatly and wisely rooted upon by human beings. And yet, as Aristotle in his wisdom put it, we seek not the ancestral but the good, and if we accept the ancestral, only because we believe the ancestral is the good. Yet does the city of the Laws bring about a true solution of the conflict between philosophy and the city? Is the city of the Laws truly a society according to reason, according to nature? Now the city of the Laws is meant to be the second best or third best solution, based on a deviation from what is simply just. Aristotle in the second book of the Politics criticized solutions suggested by Plato in the Laws because of the fact that in that city privileges are given to the wealthy as wealthy, the plutocratic or oligarchic regime, or rather oligarchic. And therefore, of course, it is based on a deviation from what is simply just. The wealth as wealth does not give a title to higher right, according to reason as well as to the classics. The best city, according to Plato, is that sketched in the Republic, where the money-makers on all levels do not in any way participate in ruling. The two ruling classes, the soldiers and the rulers proper, are propertyless, and in no way concerned with acquisition. The rulers strictly speaking are the philosophers, and therefore, this seems to be elementary, there cannot possibly be a conflict between philosophy and the city. Because there they write their own tickets, to use a simple but intelligible expression. Nevertheless, there is a conflict between the best city and justice even in the Republic, and this means ultimately a conflict between the best city and philosophy. Republic 427d. The foundation of the city is now completed. Socrates says, "Let us now see where in the city is justice and injustice." So in that perfect city there is some injustice. Now where is injustice? In the first place where is justice? The justice is primarily....results primarily in the fact that everyone is given the job for which he is by nature fit without any regard to his descent or even sex. Hence the ruling class are the best men, the rulers proper. The second best are the helpers of the rulers, soldiers; and the merely ruled are the least good. And no one--that is Plato's contention--can complain about injustice if he gets what he deserves for what he is fit by nature. But this wonderful arrangement, which is so attractive to every lover of justice, requires the abolition of the family, because otherwise you cannot be sure that there will not be considerations of nepotism in one way or the other coming in. The children must not come to know their parents, and thus become attached to them and vice versa. Because otherwise if the parents are upper class people they couldn't stand their non-gifted kids should become low class people; in the other case there might be other difficulties. So

everyone is assigned to that class of people for which he is fit. This comes into conflict with his other requirement that no one must know his parents. And therefore what you get at the end of this argument is hereditary castes based on the legal assumption that good parents generate good children and bad parents generate bad children. This is good enough as legal presumptions go, but one must also say it is a severe infraction of the principle of justice. And therefore, to say nothing of other things, the perfect regime of the Republic is not unqualifiedly just; there is a conflict between justice and the best city. And--I cannot elaborate this now--the only way of getting a perfectly just solution is that of a certain kind of private life, the life of the philosopher. That's at least what the Republic suggests.

Now let us consider the relevance of this consideration for Plato's Apology of Socrates. 29b 5-7, where Socrates suggests, what counts is not doing injustice in contradistinction of suffering injustice. Whether you suffer injustice, that is irrelevant; that does not do any harm to your soul. But whereas doing injustice does. But this is however not so easy, considering men and his complexity. And therefore we find another statement later on in 30b 2-4: "Virtue does not arise out of money, but out of virtue does money and the other things arise to men." A sentence which in the original is somewhat ambiguous, but it implied surely this meaning which I stated clearly. So in other words there cannot be...we don't have to worry about suffering harm, suffering injustice. If you are a good man, you will get all good things in addition to your justice and goodness. Differently stated, is any man free from doing injustice, and in particular, is Socrates free from doing injustice? Or to use for one moment the Biblical expression, is any man free from sinning? On the basis of the Bible we would of course answer, "No. There is no one who doesn't sin." But what is the Platonic answer? According to Plato, only the idea of justice is perfectly just; everything else which is just--human beings, institutions, laws--are not perfectly just and cannot be perfectly just. In other words, they can't help sinning. At the end of the Phaedo, when a man looks back to Socrates after having described his death, he says Socrates was a--I have it here, how are the literal words: "This were the end of our comrade, of a man as we would say, he was in his generation the best and otherwise the most sensible and most just." Well, in his generation. He doesn't say "simply." More precisely, you remember Socrates or you know of Socrates' severe condemnation of Pericles and the other outstanding Athenian statesman. He is wholly unimpressed by the splendor of Periclean Athens. Even here in the Apology we find that in 29b 7-8 when he says, "You Athenian, citizen of the greatest city and the most renowned in regard to wisdom and strength." So Socrates is a severe critic of Periclean Athens. But does he not belong to that very Athens? Does he not, in a manner, profit from that injustice which went into the making of Periclean Athens? Is it an accident that philosophy came to Athens, or emerged in Athens, after the victory in the Persian war and the emergence of the Athenian Empire? Some of you will have read Thucydides' analysis of the fatality involved in this development, and in particular of the injustice inevitably going with that. Was Plato or Socrates wholly unaware of it? The passage in the Republic to which I referred, 427d alone would prove that this was not the case. Even in the best city there will be some injustice.

Now what is the root of men's doing injustice? We can say, and that is not merely Hobbes, but also Plato, the concern with self preservation. In order to preserve yourself, to preserve your life, you are in need of means of self pre-

servation. And these are guns, knives, but also that you belong to a group of people who will come to your defense. The general word, too familiar to the political science students, is "power," no self preservation without power. Now regardless of...one does these things oneself and for oneself, or whether one profits, however indirectly, from one's city doing them, does from a strict point of view make no difference. You can be nice and always decent and never cheat, never rob, but you may very well be a beneficiary of your society, having done that. And that is morally speaking in the last analysis no great difference. Now so we are...Therefore than this question of the conflict between justice and the city, and therefore ultimately between philosophy and the city, remains.

We are now at present discussing the last part of Socrates' defense proper, which starts in 26b 3, ff. This is the first section of the Apology the purport of which is not clear. Socrates begins that part by taking issue with the low class view regarding death, namely, that one must avoid dying by all means. He refers there to Achilles, as if Achilles were Socrates' model. And he then gradually leads to a new presentation of his pragma, of his business, which he still traces to the god. He speaks no longer of his examining those Athenians who he thinks to be wise with regard to their wisdom, of examining them with regard to... those who he thinks to be wise with regard to their wisdom. He speaks now of his examining all Athenians with a view to their virtue, and of his urging them forward toward virtue. He presents himself here as a gadfly sent to the city of Athens by the god, presumably by Apollo. He had not spoken of any other god. And here we find this extraordinary statement, that he awakens and persuades and goes "each one of you," unceasingly, the whole day, stinging him everywhere, every part of his body. You remember that? And then he goes on to say...Do you have the passage there? Next sentence.

R: Yes. Page 113. "Such another is not likely to come to you,...awakened from a nap..."

S: And so on, and they would of course try to slap that gadfly, i.e., kill Socrates. It is very important. "You might perhaps be angry, perhaps." The grammatical construction is a bit complicated. There are two Greek words for "perhaps" here, with different connections. But it is clear that he means "Perhaps you will become angry." This activity, as a gadfly, as distinguished from examining the allegedly wise man, did not necessarily lead to Socrates' becoming hated, whereas examining of the man with a view to their wisdom did, and this shows most clearly that these are two very different aspects of Socrates' activity. Socrates' proreptic activity did not make him hated; it did not endanger his life. But it had a bad consequence. Will you read that again? Where we left off.

R: "...and might slap me, as Anytus advises,...someone else to sting you."

S: But one should always say "the god," and write it with a small "g" because there is always the possibility that he means the god in Delphi, in contradistinction to other gods. Yes.

R: "And that I am, as I say,...and urging you to care for virtue..."

S: "Doing always your business," in contradistinction to doing one's... "Minding always your business," i.e., never minding any own business. You under-

stand what this allusion means, at least those of you who have read the Republic. Yes?

R: "...now that is not like human conduct....namely, my poverty."

S: In other words this urging the Athenians to be virtuous, what I call the Uncle Sam thing--pointing at him, buttonholing him, saying "Did you do a good deed today?"--this did not bring Socrates' life in danger. It made him obnoxious to some extent, naturally [Laughter], but it did not bring danger. Its bad consequence is merely that Socrates' poverty, not danger to his life. We are now in a position to understand the next section. Will you read on?

R: "Perhaps it may seem strange...and advise the city."

S: "...do not dare," to make it quite clear. Now Socrates has dedicated his life--I add, from a certain moment on--altogether to his fellow citizens. He has been a busy-body; of course, it is a word which he uses here. All the more striking is then the fact that he never dared to engage in political activity. I mean what is the difference between minding everybody else's business and minding the business of the whole community? Good. Now go on.

R: "But the reason for this,...something divine and spiritual..."

S: Now let us say "demonic." Comma, "a voice" comma.

R: "...some demonic thing comes to me,...ridiculed in his indictment."

S: Now let us here...But in the original, which has been struck out by some editors, "...something divine demonic (comma) a voice." You should leave that. Socrates explains his abstention from political life by another story, but this time by a story which he has told in many places and which his judges have heard many times. The story of something divine and demonic, namely, a voice. This well-known experience of Socrates is the only possibly true basis of Xaletus' charge; that is implied. Everyone has heard that Socrates claims to have such a demonic thing, but no one else has it. And therefore that is a new demonic thing. And therefore he believes in that demonic thing and not in the gods of the city. As a well-known story this story differs from the story which was new to the audience of the Delphic Oracle. Therefore Socrates had to tell this again. And now he gives a closer description of that.

R: "I have had this from my childhood; it is a sort of voice..."

S: Let us stop here. That's another difference between that daimonion--I will now use this word; it is not easily translatable in English, unless you...in this awkward way that we would speak of the demonic thing. Another difference between the daimonion and the Delphic Oracle: the daimonion goes back to Socrates' childhood; he never claimed that the Oracle, and the divine mission proceeding from the Oracle, goes back to his childhood. Yes?

R: "...that comes to me,...but never urges me forward."

S: Yes. So that is still another difference. Whereas the Oracle of Delphi

es interpreted by Socrates manifestly urged him forward, the daimonion only holds him back. And there is another point here implied, another difference between the two things. The daimonion is not traced to a god. It must have some connection with the world of the divine, otherwise he couldn't call it demonic. But it's not directly traced to that. Yes?

R: "...it always holds me back...you may be quite sure, men of Athens..."

S: In other words, it is not only something which is an irresistible suggestion, but it is also reasonable. "Come to think of it," he says "this daimonion is rational...or obeying it, at least, is a rational thing." Yes?

R: "...that if I had undertaken...to you or to myself."

S: He doesn't say, "I would have been...I would have perished." The words "death" and "dying" are avoided in this section. Say "perished."

R: "I should have perished long ago...a private citizen, not a political man."

S: Yes. Now in this particular case, at any rate, Socrates understood the reasonableness of that voice; holding him back from politics it held him back from destruction. I said he avoids here the words "death" and "dying"--not without reason. Now this is the fifth and last and most interesting difference between the daimonion and the Delphic Oracle. The Delphic Oracle, we recall, as Socrates understood it, led him on to examine everyone thought to be wise, and therefore made him hated and endangered his life. The daimonion preserves his life. If he had gone into politics while he was already old, politics would not have been more harmful to him than his examining and admonishing all individual Athenians. When he says "If I had undertaken a long time ago to be politically active, then I would have perished a long time ago," one could raise the question: Why could he not have gone, rather, say, a few years ago into politics? Establish a parallel, because presumably the Delphic Oracle was also not a matter of many years ago but only a few years ago. Yes.

Schaeffer: Does the qualification "long ago" occur in both clauses?

S: Yes, yes, yes. And people have been worried...And one famous [phonologist?] of the last century, [sounds like "Courbet"] has deleted one of them. They like to have the text smooth. But perhaps Plato didn't like to have the text smooth. Burnet keeps the two, the two from many years. Yes?

Q: Would it possibly happen that the daimon was passing judgment on the Oracle at some point in Socrates' life? In other words, there is such a contrast between the two. Wouldn't it happen that there would be a conflict between the two?

S: Yes. Well, surely. Surely. That seems to be the case.

that seems to be so, that the Oracle pushes him toward death, and the daimonion pushes him toward life. That's what you mean. Yes. But let us first follow it a bit more closely. There was no reason why Socrates should go into politics only when already old, because if this is the ~~best~~ thing to do, then he should do it

as soon as possible. Because going into politics depended entirely on Socrates' own decision. Whereas as for his chief activity of which he had spoken so long, he had to wait for the Oracle, of course. Prior to the Oracle he didn't have any inducement to examine all the Athenians. The daimonion did not obstruct Socrates' obeying the Delphic Oracle. Or if it did, Socrates didn't pay any attention to it. But perhaps it did not obstruct it because at that time it was no longer necessary or good for Socrates to live. That's a possible explanation. At any rate--and that is the point which you raised--the essential effect of the daimonion is the opposite of the essential effect of the Delphic Oracle. By respecting and paying attention to the daimonion, Socrates accepts, within limits, the view of that loud or Muck, and...the view which he had rejected unqualifiedly, you will remember, at the beginning of this part of the Apology. And there he had rejected it with a view to the model of Achilles, who did not care about death. Now he comes to agree with a view held by Achilles in Hades, when he was already in Hades, at least as reported by Odysseus. That there is a concern, the concern with self-preservation is justified.

Now what is that daimonion? There is an enormous literature on the subject. I gave you some specimens of that at the beginning of this course--what Hegel says about it in his History of Philosophy. I will not go so far back now, and only read to you a few statements of Burnet. On Euthyphro 3b 5 and 6. "Socrates is always represented by Plato, though not of course by Xenophon..." "Of course" means here Xenophon, this retired colonel, who did not understand anything of the higher things. "Socrates is always represented by Plato,...as speaking quite lightly and even ironically of the 'divine sign.'" This is his translation of daimonion. "It belonged to the irrational part of his soul, even more than dreams, which sometimes did give positive instructions as the divine sign never did. That being so it is obviously futile to rationalize it. We must simply accept the fact that it was a perfectly real experience to Socrates, though not apparently of paramount importance. It served to justify certain instinctive reluctances of which he was unable to give a clear account to himself. But he believed in it all the same and actually heard the voice. Nearly all the recorded instances of the divine sign occurred on indifferent and even trivial occasions, and only inhibited acts which would have unfortunate consequences." Well if the consequences are very unfortunate, the occasions are not too trivial, I would say. "Socrates never appeals to it on questions of serious moment involving considerations of right and wrong. In particular the sign is not represented as having anything to do with the mission to his fellow citizens with which he believed he had been charged by God. It has nothing in common, then, with conscience." Now this latter point I think is important to make, because quite a few people have identified the daimonion with conscience. The word conscience--in Greek syneidesis--does not occur in Plato. Burnet says there is something instinctive in the daimonion. This is I think the most valuable of his remarks. Now we have seen something about instinctive activities in our very Apology. Does anyone of you remember it? [Answer inaudible] And he speaks there also of the users. And how does he call it there? In 22b 8 - c 1. A: A certain nature. S: Yes. Certain kind of... physis tis. This would be a much better lead than "conscience." Something natural.

Now I'll read to you a passage from a dialogue which is now generally, not to say universally, because after all, I do not believe it [Laughter]...regarded as spurious. The dialogue called Theages. [Writes it on blackboard] A former

student of mine, Seth Benardete, has written his master's thesis on the Theaetetus, as a student at the Committee on Social Thought. Those of you who are interested might have a look at this thesis. Now let me see. I will read to you only a few very significant passages. Good. The situation is briefly this: A man from upstate, as you might say in this country, comes to Athens with his son, Theaetetus, and the son is very eager to become a pupil of Socrates. And the father is a man who has had many high military and other offices, and he wants to have his son the best education. Then Socrates asks him, "Well, what do you wish to learn?" and "What do you wish to become?" And he proves to wish to become a tyrant. [Laughter] And that is the reason why he wants to go to school...That is an amusing, and not quite merely amusing, beginning. Now and then Socrates declines, and says, "I can't help you, your son Theaetetus. Your zeal is no wonder to me," Socrates says, "if you suppose that I especially could be of use to your boy. For I know of nothing for which a sensible man could be more zealous than for his own son's utmost improvement. But how you came to form this opinion that I would be better able to be of use to your son in his aim of becoming a good citizen [laughs], than you would yourself. And how he came to suppose that I rather than yourself would be of use to him, this does fill me with wonder. For you in the first place are my elder, and further you have held in your time many of the highest offices in Athens, and are respected by the people of your tribe far above all your fellow townsmen, and by the whole city as much as any man. Whereas neither of you can notice anything like this about me. And moreover, if Theaetetus here does despise instruction of our statesmen, and is looking for some other persons who profess to be able to educate you young people, we have here Prodicus, Gorgias, and so on, the famous sophists, and many more who are so wise that they go to our cities and persuade the noblest and wealthiest of your young men to abandon that instruction and learn from them, with a deposit, besides, of a large sum of money as their fee, and to feel thankful in addition. Some of these persons might naturally have been chosen both by your son and by yourself in preference to me. For I have no knowledge of these fair and beatific subjects of study. I only wish that I had. But what I always say you know is that I am in the position of knowing practically nothing, except one little subject, erotic matters." [Laughter] Your reaction is good. That is exactly the way in which [the father] and Theaetetus react. That's fantastic, this old man with a beard [laughter] who claims to be...in no way a playboy, claims to be a specialist only in eroticism. So now of course this is not the only occasion on which Socrates speaks of his eroticism. But, for example, at the beginning of the Protagoras, Socrates introduces himself, and is introduced, as a matter of fact, as a man he is the talk of the town, because he is in love with Alcibiades, the most beautiful of the young Athenians. He is notorious for his eros for handsome youth. Now this is...must not be taken too literally. It is also based on something like a presumption, although not a legal presumption in this case, namely, that gifted youth will also be handsome youth. That is not necessarily the case, because in the Theaetetus, for example, a very gifted youth, a mathematician, Theaetetus, is very ugly and he looks as ugly as Socrates himself. [Laughter] And yet, in a way, Socrates is in love with him. So. Now this...and some of you will know the account which Socrates...which Alcibiades, completely drunk, gives at the end of the Banquet, of his love affair with Socrates. So. Now. Therefore they laugh about it is. Socrates, the only thing which he knows is eroticism. What does he do? he the explanation which he gave why he could not take on Theaetetus as a young companion, namely, that he is only an eroticist and that is not the good way to become a tyrant, so he must give him another story, a substituted story. And that perhaps is

in the sequel. "There is something by a divine allotment, a daimonion, which has accompanied from my childhood up. It is a voice and when it occurs always indicates to me a prohibition of something I may be about to do, but never urges me on to anything. And if one of my friends consults me and the voice occurs, the same thing happens. It prohibits, and does not allow me to act. And I will produce witnesses to convince you of these facts." And then he gives a long list of terrific stories, how people were ruined who did not listen to Socrates' daimonion, and the fantastical character of these stories taken from Twilight...or reminding of Twilight, if you know this series over the TV, is one reason why this dialogue is regarded as spurious. People do not consider the fact that this is a dialogue which Socrates has two people from upstate, you know? And they were probably... that he had to use stronger than when he talked to the city slickers to whom he ordinarily talked. Now. But to come back to the main point, these stories if you have the time to read it you will be greatly amused by them. But the main point, and important for our immediate context, is this: Socrates has first declined to teach, or to converse with Theages because Socrates is only an erotic man. And then he says, "I can't take you on because my daimonion prevents me from doing it." The result is the same; he won't take on Theages. And it is a relatively polite way of saying "You are not good enough for this purpose." But the main point: the eroticism of Socrates is replaced here by his daimonion. And now I appeal again to a general rule. If a subject is without any further discussion replaced by another in Plato, it means it is replaceable by it. The two things are the same. Socrates' eros is the same as his daimonion.

Aristotle, in his short treatise On Divination by Dreams, Chapter 2, begins, says: "The nature of the other animals," animals other than man, "is demonic, but not divine." And the other animals, too, dream. Everyone has seen dogs dream. "Hence dreams are not god-sent, but they are demonic. For nature is demonic, but not divine." Divine is only the nous, intelligence, and nature works without intelligence, instinctively, as we say. In a word, I think that the daimonion of which Socrates speaks is the natural inclination of the most gifted man Plato knew. Socrates is the born philosopher from Plato's point of view, much more than any other man, and therefore all these funny features which Socrates has--the nose, the eye, you know?--and all these other funny things which he has, including Xanthippe, this all is meaningful and fits, belongs to his being. That is at least my interpretation of Socrates' daimonion. But you are quite right, what you said. The function of the daimonion is opposed, the effect of the daimonion is opposed to that of the Delphic Oracle. The daimonion is concerned with Socrates' preservation, at least up to a certain moment, and the Delphic Oracle drives him, pushes him into danger. Let us re-read the last few lines of the passage we have now read. "But it is necessary for him who truly fights..."

R: "...fights for the right,...not a public man."

S: Truly to fight for justice requires, then, that one abstains from such fight for justice. Because that fight would lead him only to death. At least it requires that one lead a private life which is relatively safe. This loutish consideration is now dropped here. And so we see that this section of the Apology, which seems to have no structure, does have a structure. I'll read to you a passage from Plato's Republic. Well maybe our friend Reinken will do it. Begin perhaps here. Begin here.

R: 496a. "There is a very small remnant, then, Adeimantus, I said, of those who consort worthily with philosophy, some wellborn and well-bred nature, it may be, held in check by exile, and so in the absence of corrupters remaining true to philosophy, as its quality bids, or ..."

S: In other words, now come that...while there are quite a few men born fit for philosophizing, there are only a few of them actually philosophizing. What is the obstacle, then?

R: "...or it may happen that a great soul born in a little town scorns and disregards its parochial affairs, and a small group perhaps might by natural affinity be drawn to it from other arts which they justly disdain, and the bridle of our companion Theages..."

S: That's the same Theages.

R: "...also might operate as a restraint. For in the case of Theages all other conditions were at hand for his becalming from philosophy, but his sickly habit of body keeping him out of politics holds him back. My own case, the daimonion, is hardly worth mentioning--for I suppose it has happened to few or none before me. And those who have been of this little company and have tasted the sweetness and blessedness of this possession and who have also come to understand the madness of the multitude sufficiently and have seen that there is nothing, if I may say so, sound or right in any politics, and that there is no ally with whose aid the champion of justice could escape destruction, but that he would be as a man who has fallen among wild beasts, unwilling to share their misdeeds and unable to hold out singly against the savagery of all, and that he would thus, before he could in any way benefit his friends or the city, come to an untimely end without doing any good to himself or others--for all these reasons I say the philosopher remains quiet, minds his own affair, and, as it were, standing aside under shelter of a wall in a storm and blast of dust and eldest and eldest others filled full of lawlessness, is content if in any way he may keep himself free from iniquity and unholy deeds through this life and take his departure with fair hope, serene and well content when that comes."

S: Yes. You see the consideration of safety is also here mentioned: a very striking parallel. Yes. Now is there any point which you would like to discuss regarding the daimonion? Yes?

Schaeffer: I didn't understand the remark you made earlier about the significance of the ugly things. S: I beg your pardon? Schaeffer: You mentioned the meaningfulness of Xenippus.

S: Everything fits together. That is the hypothesis, in the old, rhetorical sense of the word "hypothesis," on which the work of Plato and also Xenophon is based. That these are not merely funny idiosyncrasies, but that they are connected with the very substance of Socrates.

Schaeffer: In other words, is the connection there that Socrates' eros is connected to other things than...?

S: Yes. In other words this eros is not...Yes. Yes. Not the body, but the

soul. Yes?

Q: If the daimonion is the natural thing and not divine, how does that go together with Socrates' argument that the demons...or if he believes in demonic things, then he believes in gods?

S: But still, demons would nevertheless be lower than gods. In Plato's *Benquet* there is a discussion, and the characteristic thesis of Socrates regarding Eros is, he is not a god but lower than the gods, namely, a demon. A demon is a being lower than a god. Eros being desire for something, and hence longing for something, and therefore based on a lack, on a defect, whereas a god is supposed to be a perfect being, which does not lack anything. Yes?

Q: Does that then mean that nature is a lower divine ?

S: Nature...because of the lack of nous. The instinctiveness. If a tree or an animal grows, or any other natural activity, this is not intellectual; it is striving for something which is very meaningful, but...very meaningful for preservation, for preservation of the species, for perfection, growth, and so on, and yet it is not a conscious striving for bringing these things about. This is what nature...I mean used in contradistinction to nous means.

Q: But does it mean that it's partly divine, or that it's against the divine?

S: Well, I think, without going into the complicated thing, would say nature is a part of the whole, the highest part of which is the divine proper, intelligence. Which you find in men and which perhaps you find also, according to Plato and Aristotle, in the whole heavenly order and so on. But not in the natural things proper. They long for something which they can never reach, and this gives them their peculiar charm as well as their peculiar melancholy, that they never can be redeemed, as it were, from that non-intellectual character which their whole life has. Read this chapter in Aristotle to which I refer. That is I think the clearest statement. To which one could easily object, of course, that this is Aristotle and not Plato. I quite agree with that. But the question is whether a remark of Aristotle is not more helpful for understanding a very enigmatic Platonic utterance than any other man's statement. Good. So then let us go on, where we left off. 32a 4.

R: "I will give you powerful proofs of this, not mere words, but what you honor more,--actions."

S: Period. That is not well translated. "...not speeches, but what you honor," you underlined, "deeds." Socrates honors speeches more than deeds. This "not speeches" may of course also refer to that voice, in opposition to the voice, you know? Deeds, not a voice--something audible--but deeds. There is a remark of Burnet which I thought we could consider. "Socrates proceeds to give two instances in which he had opposed the government of the day regardless of the consequences to himself. There is nothing about the divine sign here," in this section. "It was not that but his own judgment of what was lawful and just which guided him." I would say, very well. The daimonion would have opposed these actions of Socrates, because they brought him into mortal danger, as we will see.

R: "And listen to what happened to me,...ordinary and commonplace, but true."

S: Now Socrates is going to prove that despite his daimonion he exposed his life when it was his duty to do so. That's the meaning of these stories. Now let us read the first one.

R: "I, men of Athens, never held...fear of imprisonment or death."

S: Yes. Now Socrates does not say that this story is known to the audience or to all. Whereas Xenophon in the Memorabilia, the end of chapter 1, says that this is...that is Xenophon's key proof of Socrates' piety, his conduct of the trial of the generals from the Battle of the Arginusae. Now this incident happened in 406, that is to say, not so long ago, seven years ago. Perhaps Socrates' action did not make the great impression on all, and therefore Socrates [has to?] mention it. He says here in c 2. "You my judges are the same who acted illegally against the ten generals and myself." So "you are nice defenders of justice; you grossly disregarded the law." There is here a note from Brust. Well, it's not important. So here Socrates says, "Look, this shows clearly what"...the immediate context, "This shows clearly what it means to go into politics and to try to be just in politics. I did it once, the only occasion when I had any participation in government proper, and I was the only one who took the side of right and I came into mortal danger." And now the second example.

R: "That was when the democracy still existed;...by action, not in word only,..."

S: "...not by speech, but by deed." It's the same opposition he used at the beginning of this section. Because it is very easy to speak justly, as distinguished from acting justly.

R: "...that I did not care a whit...you can have many witnesses."

S: Let us stop here. Now Socrates refers again to the dangers arising from the changes of regimes by speaking of the fact that first there was a democracy, and then there came an oligarchy. This was about four years before the trial. And therewith he refers to the dangers coming from the variety of regimes; the mere variety shows that there is a possibility of preferring a regime other than the established one to the established one. And that is of course a high crime, at least to the extent if one acts upon it. But in passionate times a mere sympathy for the non-established regime is a grave thing. Socrates was not fully loyal to the democracy because he didn't believe in that, we know that, and he didn't deny that, if full loyalty means to be persuaded a hundred percent that it is the best regime. He was not. He refers at the end of this passage to "many witnesses". The availability of many witnesses proves the need for witnesses. The two political deeds of Socrates are not a matter of common knowledge, and therefore the need for witnesses. Now the democracy was then restored at the time of the trial. You see his amazing impartiality. He gives one example of a gross injustice of the democracy and one example of a gross injustice of the oligarchy, without passing any value judgments on the two, which was also a very courageous political act. In particular Socrates doesn't claim that he contributed in any way, by deed or speech, to the overthrow of the oligarchy, whereas his comrade Chaerephon, who was in the democratic camp, was exiled during these nine or so months while the oli-

garchy was established. This question of the oligarchy and Socrates' conduct under it is discussed at some length by Xenophon in the Memorabilia, Book One, chapter 1, paragraph 32, ff. "When the Thirty," the thirty tyrants, generally called the Thirty because the government proper, the executive, consisted of thirty, "When the Thirty killed many of the citizens--and not the most inferior ones--and urged many on toward unjust acts, Socrates said somewhere that it seemed to him to be strange if someone who has become a herd [herdsman?] of cows would make the cows lesser and worse and would not therewith admit that he is a bad cowherd." [Quote comes from chapter 2] Socrates says it "somewhere;" he did not say it to the tyrants, to the Thirty. In other words Socrates did not --and the sequence shows it--he did not do anything for their destruction, whereas the claim to respectability of men like Anytus was that they had brought about the restoration of the democracy and stood up against these people. That is doubtless a part of why Socrates was...a part of the reason why Socrates was unpopular in Athens. Yes?

R: "Do you believe that I could have lived...of the highest importance?"

S: Now that is a very, a remarkable statement, isn't it? Apart from these two cases, in 70 years (Socrates was about 70 years old) Socrates did not defend the right or act in a manner worthy of a good man. That is quite remarkable, because it is very bold. Yes?

R: "Far from it, men of Athens;...if I engaged in any public activity,..."

S: You see this "if" is very interesting. "If I engaged in any political action. Well, twice he did. Yes?"

R: "...and in private,...to be my pupils."

S: Let us stop. Socrates makes now quite clear that he did not do much politically, on the political plain, and he thus prepares, as we will see, his return from his excursions on his political activity [a very short one?] to what he did in a private capacity. Now the last remark just read by Mr. Reinken, the reference to "those whom they say to be my pupils," that is a very at that time perfectly intelligible reference to Alcibiades and Critias, of course, these terrible playboys who were connected with Socrates and...But that is the only reference--only hint--at this unsavory connection.

R: "But I was never any one's teacher....and hear what I say."

S: Now let us stop here. Socrates was never a teacher. I mean he was never a political man. He lived a private life. But this private life was not entirely private because otherwise he would not become conspicuous, and nothing would have happened to him. So what he did was something in between private and public; he was a teacher. He no longer takes up here the other part of the indictment, the impiety charge, as you see. He permitted others to listen while he minded his own business. The question of course is, when he says "anyone could listen in," did the poor have as much time to listen to Socrates as the rich? There were no fellowships and foundations at that time. [Laughter] and also as regards the end of this passage, is questioning and answering incompatible with teaching, you know? That is not a refutation of the charge that he was teaching.

Yes?

R: "And whether any of them turns out well...love to spend much of their time with me?"

S: "Enjoy," [Professor Strauss' elaboration is inaudible]

R: "You have heard the reason, men of Athens...to say like to listen when..."

S: "They enjoy," again.

R: "...enjoy listening when those...for it is amusing."

S: No, no: "it is not unpleasant." That is translated as...So we have seen this before. This is a very simple example of the general rule which I stated some time ago that there is never an identical repetition. And here again, if you compare it with the first statement which occurs in 23c 2-5, you see that the word chaire [sp?], enjoy, occurs here twice, and not only once. Secondly, at that time he spoke only of the young ones who enjoy it; here is silence about the young ones, because Socrates denies he is a teacher, and a teacher is one surrounded by younger people, and therefore he is...But the most important thing, he says it is not unpleasant. Which means this spectacle is pleasant not only to frivolous, wealthy youth, but it is in itself pleasant, even for Socrates. Because the ridiculous, of a certain level, is pleasant for a sensible man. And if a pompous ass who has some good qualities--otherwise he wouldn't be interesting--is debunked, that is doubtless a spectacle which a reasonable man might reasonably enjoy. And Socrates, we must assume, did that. Socrates doing, minding his own business is very pleasant to Socrates and his companions, and this alone would be a sufficient motive for minding his business in this manner. So. We'll leave it at that, and we'll discuss the rest next time.

Now we have discussed last time the passage in which Socrates speaks of his daemonion. I think I can now use the Greek word without making the hopeless attempt to translate it by demonic thing. The most important consideration is that the daemonion is radically different from the Delphic Oracle. The daemonion is concerned with preserving Socrates' life; the Delphic Oracle endangers Socrates' life. We have also to consider the place where these two things--the daemonion and the Delphic Oracle--are spoken of. And not only that they are spoken of in different parts, but also there is a movement from the one, from the Delphic Oracle, to the daemonion.

The Delphic Oracle is spoken of in the context of the first accusers. In the first place the first accusers did not say anything about Socrates' impiety. This was merely an inference on the part of the listeners. But contradicting that is the assertion that the first accusers said first only that Socrates corrupts the young and then when asked, as it were, "corrupting by doing what?" did they speak of his impiety. So here again, one can say, Socrates' impiety is an inference on the part of the accusers themselves. An insincere inference, but nevertheless an inference. Now we also have observed that Socrates changes the wording of the charge...I'm sorry. This fact, that impiety is presented as a kind of inference, justifies Socrates' change of the wording of the official charge, namely, by putting the corruption charge first and the impiety charge in the second place. Now it is in the context of the discussion of the present accusers, of the late accusers, that he speaks of the daemonion. The daemonion is presented as a fact admitted by Socrates and generally known, which underlies the charge itself. There was an allusion to that in 31d, as you may recall, that Meletus treating comically the daemonion had said Socrates introduces new daemons, new demonic things. And Socrates admits now, "Well there is one basis for the charge, and that is my having and speaking of my daemonion." Now what is the daemonion? It only holds back. And I tried to show last time that therefore it is only the negative side of the same phenomenon which positively is eros, Socrates' urge for philosophy and potential philosophers, and which of course holds him back from everything else which is not conducive to philosophy and to philosophers.

Now there is a conflict, or at least an opposition, between the Delphic Oracle and the daemonion. That is implied in what I said before. But this conflict can be resolved at least verbally in the following way: By the statement made by Socrates before, whoever has the divine good things gets by this very fact all the lower good things. In other words, there is no conflict between philosophizing, or however one might call Socrates' conflict, and therefore the Delphic Oracle, which induced him to engage in philosophizing, and the daemonion. Whether this is a true solution remains to be seen. Eros has of course not the narrow meaning now ascribed to what they call sex. It has...Although what they now call sex is a part of that phenomenon. Eros is striving for the beautiful, the noble, for something resplendent and charming, and therefore also for beautiful human beings. Therefore it is also concerned with the highest pleasure, because nothing can be fully kalon, fully fine, without also being pleasant. Therefore Socrates' activity, which in the Apology appears only in the form of examining men who are believed to be wise, is...this activity is, as Socrates says it with a great understatement, not unpleasant. This was the end of what we discussed last time. Now is there any point you would like to raise now? Failing that we will go on. Yes?

Q: Is there a difference between an eros for wisdom, and what is in the word itself, that is philia?

S: Philia. Well that is...Aristotle says these are two entirely different phenomena, philia and eros, and that is a very sober and common sensical assertion. But Plato does not leave it at that. Plato never leaves it at the common sensical distinctions. Plato always transcends them, goes to their depth or to their highest height, however you might look at them, and there they...many things coincide. Take this...Plato asks, What is justice? And the ultimate answer to that question is, Philosophizing. He raises the question, What is eros? And eros in itself has nothing to do with justice. As you know even from modern novels. So and again Plato's answer is, Eros is, on its highest level again, philosophizing. In a shorter writing, which today is regarded as spurious, the Hipparchus, he even goes so far as to suggest that love of gain, generally regarded as something very low in antiquity, love of gain in its highest sense is philosophizing, because love of gain is of course love of true gain and not of such dubious gain--you know, you corner the market and next year you yourself fall into bankruptcy. True gain, stable gain, lasting gain. Again, what else can that be but the truth? That is the general way of Plato's reasoning. Some people call this a metaphysical way of looking at things, an expression which I would not favor. But still perhaps it helps one or the other of you. To look into the deepest depth or the highest height of the phenomena, and there many things prove to be akin and even identical which on the surface are radically distinguished. And therefore also the Platonic doctrine which is more popular, that there is only one virtue ultimately, whereas in Aristotle you have this sober presentation of the various virtues, each by itself, and yet also the assertion they are inseparable, although not identical. Now did I answer your question?

Q: I was wondering whether you were suggesting that Socrates is perhaps immoderate in his quest for wisdom.

S: Immoderate. Yes, that is not bad. Only it is not perhaps...One should replace it by a different word. The Greek word for moderation, sophrosyne--at least that is my ordinary translation--which, incidentally, does not occur in the Apology for various reasons we would have to dig a bit deeper than we have done hitherto. Now there are two opposites of sophrosyne. And one is...Well, no, I must begin at the beginning. Sophrosyne in Aristotle's common sensical analysis in the Ethics, there sophrosyne means simply self control regarding the sensual pleasures. And this would have at its opposite dissoluteness. But this is, I mean while very important for practical purposes, is not very important in the highest respect. There is another opposition. [Goes to blackboard] Sophrosyne. And that is opposed to two things. Hybris, which we can translate by insolence or pride. And mania, madness, insanity. Now no one will say that Socrates had hybris; but what about mania? Madness. Does this occur in Socratic contexts? Yes?

A: Yes. S: Where? Do you remember? A: The story about him at the beginning of the Symposium... A: Phaedrus. S: Phaedrus. Mania means the opposite of sophrosyne. One can state it without hurting anyone's tender feelings by saying that someone who is moderate in his desire for the truth is not a philosopher. Makes sense. Moderation in other respects, for example, regarding speeches,

is a virtue. But moderation in one's thinking is not a virtue. On the contrary, and to that extent...And there is of course also a connection between mania and eros, as appears from the Phaedrus among other things, and as is known common sensically in the fact that when people are in love they are not sober, especially in regard to the objects of their love. You know? It is a kind of madness. That has also been said by people other than Plato. Yes?

Q: In the Symposium doesn't Agathon say that Socrates has hybris, that Socrates just comes in and Agathon says, "Come sit by me," and Socrates says, "Well if knowledge flowed from one person to another like water, like we can make water flow from one vessel to another, then I would be glad to sit with you. But since it doesn't I'm going to sit over here with somebody else." And Agathon says that Socrates has hybris.

S: [Says a Greek word here that is difficult to make out.] Well this could on the surface mean only that it is a kind of joke. Whether Socrates doesn't have a hybris of sorts we can...that we can discuss later on when we are more advanced in the study of the Apology. But at first glance it is safer to speak of the mania rather than of hybris. You wanted to say something.

Q: You spoke last time about the conflict between philosophy and the city, and I asked you before you made those remarks whether there was a necessary conflict, whether the conflict is generally necessary as it's presented in the Apology, that is, a deadly serious conflict. You went on to explain that in terms of the Republic and the Laws that there was a disproportion between reason and the city, and it seemed to me on reflection that a disproportion is not quite the same thing as a conflict, at least the kind of conflict that we see in the Apology.

S: I mean if there is such a disproportion, would this not inevitably lead to a conflict? I mean under the conditions of antiquity. I mean there is a given point where two powers raise claims on man's allegiance. And would there not be a conflict caused by this very fact? Simply, if the laws of the city as Socrates and Plato understand them imply a prohibition against philosophy, is then the conflict not inevitable? Not necessarily at every point, but in principle?

A: It's inevitable only if the philosopher is compelled to make an appearance in the marketplace. I mean if he philosophizes in public.

S: But you have to consider the gods of the city. If the philosophers as philosophers do not recognize the gods of the city, and even if they never make popular speeches about that subject, can they not always be denounced? I mean the prohibition is not against speaking only on the marketplace, denying the gods on the marketplace, but denying the gods simply. And they commit a criminal act by doing this. Whether the law courts act on that or not, that depends on accidental matters—the degree of excitement, you know? And displeasure with the conditions, and so on. That is secondary. But the principle is there.

Q: But to pursue this point a bit further, in the Apology we see that debunked...hurt Athenians in public, and this has led to the charge that he has corrupted the youth and to support that charge he had been accused of impiety. Now it seems to me that if he had not debunked the Athenians in public, the chain would have been broken and he would not have been accused of impiety.

S: That is the way in which he presents it. But the question is whether that is sufficient. And the decision will depend ultimately on the question, How relevant is the story of the Delphic Oracle and what Socrates did on the basis of it? Is this an adequate account of Socrates' life? A question which will be brought out later. We must wait for that. Yes?

Schaeffer: In 27c, Socrates had used...S: 27c. Schaeffer: He had used his belief in this daimonic thing as a proof that he believed in spiritual beings. Now the fact that he uses the word daimonion rather than daimon, does that signify that there really is a difference between the spiritual things that he is talking about and the spiritual things as generally understood?

S: Well, spiritual beings is an awkward and misleading translation. Let us say, demonic things, and he has his demonic things. But the point is that in his discussion with Meletus he doesn't say a word to the effect that he possesses that demonic thing. That he brings out only later in the passage we discussed last time. And here he argues very simply and crudely they cannot...if a man recognizes horrid things he recognizes horses. Now can there be a horse shoe if there are no horses? So if there are demonic things there must be demons. Now what are demons? Either gods--well, then a man who recognizes demonic things recognizes gods, or they are the children of gods and a human parent. In the latter case he recognizes also gods, just as a man who recognizes mules recognizes horses and donkeys. That's a simple argument.

Schaeffer: I'm wondering about the meaning of daimonic things, not a proof of [remainder inaudible]

S: That is not in any way explained. We must leave it at what is said about it, and the only explanation which makes sense, especially in the light of the original wording of the indictment which Socrates transforms as I have shown, the only historical, factual basis is that Socrates was known to speak of his demonic thing. And since this demonic thing had nothing to do with the demonic things known to other Athenians, one could rightly say he introduces a new demonic thing. And in order to put this on a broader basis as all political men would do, say he introduces new demonic things in the plural. That's all one can say. Yes, and you will be the last.

Q: Barker, in his introduction to Aristotle, commenting on the problems of translating the Greek language, he says that when we're discussing law, when we read law, we think of law in terms of the Romans, the way the Romans thought of law, and that an offense against the law for Greece was different than an offense against the law for the Romans. I wondered if you could comment...

S: I do not know the context. What does Barker say is the difference? I have read that introduction, but a long time ago.

A: He went on to say that the Greeks didn't distinguish between...didn't set aside a special realm of law as opposed to an offense against society and social relationships...

S: But did the Romans make such a distinction? I mean did the Latins make such a distinction? Well I think that is a question. It is possible that is the

practice of the lawyers, and especially of civil law it may be so, but if you think for example that it was, after all, the emperor worship was a part of the Roman political order and therefore not to sacrifice to the emperor was a crime. And there was only a special allowance made for the Jews; they had this idiosyncrasy that they didn't wish to sacrifice to a mortal...the emperor was also thought to be mortal, but to someone like the Roman emperor.

Q: When we...now when we break a law we consider ourselves attacking the authority structure of the city, when we see that act as attacking the authorities. Did the Greeks see that same act as something more than simply attacking the authority of the city?

S: Well the question...that was always a kind of more or less noticeable of the [sounds like holy] background, if you mean that. Of a holy background. But that was also true in Rome. And later on in the imperial period, this may not be visible in the practice of the lawyers, but it came out again. And of course in modern times the Roman law was rejuvenated and reintroduced, altogether in the Middle Ages, there you have a clear distinction between the human law and the divine law, or the canonized law. But in Rome that is a great question. In Greek also you have a distinction between...in Latin between *ius* and *fas*. *Fas* means more the divine right and *ius* more the human right. But I do not believe that this is relevant here. When we discuss these matters we have in mind a notion of a fundamentally secular society, strictly secular, which permits and even tolerates and perhaps even more than tolerates also religious convictions, but which have as such no legal relevance whatever. And that was not so in former times, either pagan or Christian, or Islam for that matter. Good.

Q: Could you repeat the point on the possible conflict between the daimonion and the Delphic Oracle?

S: No, well the daimonion, as he explicitly says, holds his back from politics, and therefore it saves his life. Because to the extent to which he went into politics--twice--his life came into danger, under the democracy as well under the oligarchy. The Delphic Oracle, however, by commanding him, as he presents it, to examine every Athenian and therewith debunking him, and so Socrates became hated, and the net result was that they tried to kill him. So the effect of the Delphic Oracle is life destroying, and the effect of the daimonion is life preserving. Up to this point; we must see whether there is not a kind of...whether Socrates doesn't find an agreement, an ultimate agreement. Q: But up to this point we haven't found any agreement. S: No. No, no. We have to leave it at that. So now I think we will continue. And we must have read last time the passage when he spoke of the fact that his examining people is not unpleasant. R: Bottom of 119. S: And we begin at the sequel, c 4-7.

R: "But, as I believe,..."

S: Not "as I believe," "as I assert."

R: "...as I assert,...by divine power to do anything whatsoever."

S: "By divine allotment." That is very interesting. Socrates now minimizes the importance of the Delphic Oracle by speaking in the plural--oracles--and put-

ting it on the same level as dreams. So the Delphic Oracle is after all not so terribly important. What remains of it? Well, gods, mysteries, a certain mysterious change in Socrates from his youthful physiologist to what he did in later years. And that such a change took place we know clearly from the Phaedo, Plato's Phaedo. By implication also from Xenophon's Memorabilia. Only in the Phaedo it is made clear that it was not a mysterious change but a perfectly reasonable change, because he saw the inadequacy of this kind of natural philosophy and turned therefore to another kind. Good. Now go on. But this is part of the movement which I mentioned. First this activity, Socrates' life activity, is not unpleasant, meaning, it is pleasant, even to Socrates. And now a further step in the same direction, the Delphic Oracle is not so important. Any dream which Socrates had would have had the same effect. Yes?

R: "This, Athenians, is true...many of them present, whom I see..."

S: Let us stop here. Now Socrates is concerned with proving that he was not a teacher; that is the context. Meaning that he did not corrupt the young. The young themselves, after they have grown up, would testify against Socrates if he corrupted them. Or if the young themselves did not want to do this to their old teacher, well, their relatives would. The letter reminds us of Aristophanes' Clouds, where when the father, Strepsiades tries to sue against Socrates and wants to have the help of his son, Pheidippides, Pheidippides, while not running to Socrates' defense exactly, refuses to help his father in burning down Socrates' think tank. You want to say something?

Q: A.E. Taylor says, referring to this particular passage, that according to Athenian law at that time, all acts before the establishment of Anytus and Melitus had been pardoned, so that Socrates is talking to these people by telling them, "Well, you can bring your witnesses forth," knowing full well that he's been pardoned from all these previous acts and these witnesses can't speak...

S: Well, you see, I have read...Burnet also makes use of that law. There are two possibilities. The first that Plato in writing the Apology disregarded certain legal impossibilities; I regard this as possible. And the second is that there was perhaps some legal subtlety about the interpretation of these amnesties, subtleties which we do no longer know. We have to stick to what we have in our hand. Good. Now? Read the sequel.

R: "...first Crito here, who is of my own age...who is also present;..."

S: Well, all right, all right. R: "...then there is Lyzias...Apollodorus is present."

S: You see one of the few mentions of Plato in the dialogues of Plato. Now where the young one, the corrupted young one is still alive, and this would be the normal case because people usually die not in their youth, that young one might have prevailed on his family not to compromise him or his family by testifying against Socrates. Is this not implied? And therefore we do not know how many of these corrupted young ones prevailed on their elders. Socrates thus alludes to the questionable character of this kind of reasoning. We will later on have to return to this enumeration of men. Some of them are quite well known to us, especially Crito and Critobulus. Crito is the hero of the Crito, which we will read later, a very wealthy gentleman farmer. Critobulus apparently a good for nothing, but not

through Socrates' fault. And the others--Theages is the one of whom I spoke last time in this dialogue...he wanted to become a tyrant, you know, and Socrates refused to accept him as a pupil. And Adimantus of course we all know from the Republic. There are altogether seven possible victims of Socrates. You may check me. And five only alive. But seventeen names of men, which include also the parricidal, of course. We will come back to that later. Good. Two are dead, as you must have seen--Theages is dead and Theodotus is dead. We'll come back to this later. Go on.

R: "And I can mention to you many others,...I am speaking the truth?"

S: Well we have seen that this argument is not fully conclusive. I mean the corrupted ones probably would, owing to their corruption, be on Socrates' side. Let us grant that. But as for the relatives there is a question. There is a question whether they should compromise the black sheep in the family in public. That is the difficulty. Good. Someone wanted to say something!

Fielding: Could not Meletus produce Critias, Callias, and Alcibiades?
S: Pardon? Fielding: Could not Meletus produce Critias?

S: They were dead by that time.

Fielding: Well I mean that's why they obviously can't be literally produced here...

S: That is true. And there the family of course would also be unable to rise in defense. But this Callias-Alcibiades issue is not mentioned here at all; only once alluded to without mentioning the names. And, well, the defense of Socrates against that you would find in Xenophon's Memorabilia, Chapter 2, second chapter. And he simply says that Socrates knew them; they came to Socrates because they knew that Socrates was a very gifted man and they believed they could be furthered by being together with him. But Socrates has no responsibility whatever for their terrible actions. And shows this in detail.

Fielding: But the Athenians might think so.

S: Sure. What can you do? I mean, guilt by association, or what?

Fielding: But he doesn't, you know, defend himself against that, I mean...

S: Well the simple reason would be, I suppose, that he implies the thought is so fantastic that it is not worthy even to be mentioned. But it is one of the many defects which this apology as an apology has. But Plato had his reasons for not mentioning this. Yes? But he wrote two...Well, there are two dialogues Alcibiades, written by Plato. The Critias is not the same Critias, but still the name is the same. But in the dialogue Charmides Critias and Charmides, two leaders of the Thirty, when they were still younger, have a conversation with Socrates on the subject of moderation, these future tyrants. That is one of Plato's jokes, just as he has a discussion on courage between Socrates and two defeated generals. I suppose victorious generals wouldn't have any conversation with Socrates. Yes.

Q: In the Gorgias, Socrates says that if a student of a rhetorician turns out

bad, that's
biades?

the teacher. What application would this have to Alcibiades?

S: You can also put it in another way. Socrates says in the Gorgias also, and here, too, later on, that he is a truly political man. And yet the only man who really takes care of politics in the proper manner is condemned to death by the man [he?] tried to educate. Or take a more simple example. His objection to Pericles and Themistocles and the others is they...that they were unable to take care of their own sons, and their sons were either good for nothings or very inferior people. Well, what about Socrates' own children? Wholly insignificant men. And so. This is a part of a very long argument, and where the irony of Socrates of Socrates is quite visible. Or to take another particularly funny example, when he is asked at a banquet presented by Xenophon, Why did you marry Xanthippe, the most difficult of all women, past, present, and future? [Laughter]. And then he said, "Well, I knew that I had to get along with human beings. And therefore just if I wish to become a horse man I would of course not take a lame mare but the most fiery horse, for the same reason I took this most difficult woman, thinking that if I can handle her I can handle anyone." And the funny thing is of course that he did not even succeed in handling Xanthippe; how could he succeed in handling the Athenian masses? So that is a problem which Socrates never solved, and that is the obvious comedy of Socrates' life. Good. Now let us go on now.

R: "Well, gentlemen, this,...to say in my defence."

S: Let us stop here. So here we are at the end of Socrates' speech of defence, and hence in particular of its last part, the part beginning 28b 3. You remember, the part which doesn't seem to have a clear subject. Now let us first review that part and see whether we can see some thread through this argument from 28b 3 to here. It begins as follows: It is contemptible to be concerned with one's preservation, especially when one exposes one's life, oneself to mortal danger through obeying the command of the god. Fear of death is fear of Hades, a grave equation. Fear of death is fear of Hades, and therefore pretending to know what one does not know, namely, the things in Hades. Socrates will obey the god's command, i.e., he will philosophize, even if it will be forbidden as a capital crime by an Athenian law. Obeying the god's commands means examining all Athenians in regard to virtue, and urging them on toward virtue, as distinguished from money. For we obtain all other good things through virtue, and not virtue through the other goods. Which implies, although it is there not stated, if we care for our becoming as for our becoming as virtuous as possible, we do not have to care for our self preservation. Because all other goods follow from it. By killing Socrates the Athenians will not harm him, whom they cannot harm anyway because of his virtue. They will harm only themselves, for he is sent by the god as a gadfly which does not cease stinging everyone the whole day at every part of his body. In other words, philosophizing has now tacitly been replaced by this gadfly activity. This activity, this unceasing concern with the virtue of every Athenian, does not indeed make Socrates universally as his debunking of the allegedly wise did, but it made him poor. Now poverty is surely not a desirable condition, but according to the ordinary estimate, less bad than being killed. While he was unceasingly concerned with the affairs of every Athenian, he did not dare to become politically active. This was due to his daimonion, which held him back from doing the political things. His daimonion, in contradistinction to the Delphic Oracle, was concerned with Socrates'

preservation. Hence Socrates was only twice dragged into politics in his whole life, and each time he came into mortal danger. Otherwise he did...he minded only his own business, i.e., he never was a teacher of anyone. He did have followers. Some men followed him because of the pleasure he procured for them by debunking the allegedly wise. He did not corrupt anyone. Socrates is silent in this part on the impiety charge. He takes care of it implicitly by his constant reference to his divine mission. And one can rightly say, if a man has a divine mission there must be gods. Good. This as a summary of this section. And I hope that its meaning has now become somewhat clearer. Yes?

Bruell: Is it correct to say that in the last part as opposed to the first, the impiety charge is taken up first and then the corruption? S: In this last section the impiety charge is not taken up explicitly at all. Bruell: No, not the charge, but...What I should have said is that the Delphic Oracle was taken up in the first part of the last section as a reason for Socrates' disobedience.

S: Disobedience to the Athenians. Bruell: Yes. S: Yes, but I think it would be better to say, and could more easily be supported by evidence, that the impiety charge is dropped and only the corruption charge is discussed, because the impiety charge has been disposed of by the refutation of Meletus. That it is lingering on, that goes without saying. But the more obvious fact is that the corruption charge is explicitly mentioned in this section and not the impiety charge. I mean you must always compare comparable things. You may compare explicit utterances with other explicit utterances, and you may compare implicit utterances or hints with other hints. You cannot do both things at the same time. So now let us go on here. Did you want to say something?

Q: Just a short question. Do you think it's possible that the discussion where he adds that "I believe I have been commanded to do this by the god through oracles and dreams and in every way in which any man was ever commanded by divine power to do anything whatsoever," is not so much a downgrading of the Oracle, as an attempt to prove how completely his life has been infected by or permeated by divinity and divine command?

S: You can say that. But still, if you consider that at the beginning of this whole argument the sole reason given was the Delphic Oracle, this answer to Chaerephon's question, and when he speaks now of "oracles and dreams" in the plural, that surely takes away from the importance of the Delphic Oracle. Now shall we go on? Where we left off.

R: "Perhaps some one among you...apparently, in the very greatest danger."

S: "Apparently..." Well, all right. R: "Evidently?" S: No, no, no, no. "As I might see." In other words, that is not necessarily Socrates' own view.

R: "Perhaps some one with these thoughts...fairly if I said to him..."

S: Let us stop here. Now in the conclusion of his speech, Socrates points to another reason why his judges, or one of them, might have become angry at him, a reason wholly different from the reasons given before. By this he does his best to provoke that anger, by pointing out they could be angry with him. And he retracts the suggestion, as you see, "if one of you is so disposed,"--"I don't be-

lieve that there is, but just in case." This retraction makes things worse rather than better, as you can easily see if you say something unconditionally, something unquestionable to someone else in his face and retract it by a conditional clause. It's only a more subtle way of making the same insult. Yes? Now what does he say to these men, that Socrates didn't follow the ordinary Athenian practice, bring his kids with him and they should cry and show all kinds of things and arouse the compassion of the judges. That is beautifully presented in Aristophanes' Waspe. A judge describes the great felicity they derive from the fact that the defendants try to rouse their compassion and at the same time tell jokes in order to please them, to exhilarate them. Yes. But Socrates doesn't speak of jokes...of jokes. [laughs]. He speaks only of compassion arousing. Yes?

R: "...My friend, I too have relatives,...and beg you to acquit me."

S: Now Socrates mentions this fact about his children, which implies-- one of these children was very young as we know from the end of the Phaedo when Xanthippe is shown with him --that he was still biologically, if I may say so, young. That is not unimportant for a judgment of the situation. Yes?

R: "And why shall I not do so?...I think it is not right for me..."

S: "Not fun," "not noble," "not fair." Kalon, not [agathon?].

R: "...it is not noble for me...in some way superior to most men."

S: Let us stop here. Socrates traces his refusal to comply with the common Athenian practice explicitly not to his contempt of death, here, but to his concern with his reputation and also with the reputation of his city. That is important, that here the...here he does not longer say that death doesn't mean anything to him. Yes?

R: "If then those of you who are supposed...in any other virtue whatsoever..."

S: You see there is no virtue--sophrosyne, for example--moderation is not mentioned here, Yes?

R: "...are to behave in such a way,...than one who keeps quiet."

S: "Such pitiful dramas" would be more literal, and not misleading translation. The reputation of Athens requires that the outstanding Athenians be not permitted to appeal to the pity of the judges, because it is a disgrace to them and therefore also to the city of Athens. Because the city will be judged after its most outstanding members. Yes. Now?

R: "But apart from the question of reputation,...especially when impiety..."

S: "By Zeus" he says here in this...

R: "...especially, by Zeus, when impiety...best for me and for you."

S: Yes. Now such an appeal to the pity or compassion of the judges would also not be just, apart from the fact that it brings a bad reputation to the city.

Nor would it be pious--and this is a magnificent parting shot, with which he ends his speech, because the common Athenian practice is presupposed on allowing for perjury. In inducing the judges to become perjured. And therefore Socrates says "this is the very proof of his piety, that he does not engage in this practice. Now while a pious man would not commit perjury, nor induce others to commit perjury, a man not believing in the gods of the city might also fail to do these things. Socrates' refusal to play on the pity of the judges does not prove that he believes that the gods of the city are. I believe that is clear. I mean after all there are so many reasons against perjury, against influencing the judges' judgment more precisely, that this can also be established without reference to the gods of the city. So this is the end of Socrates' apology proper, the speech of defense. And we can make here a pause again before we turn to the next section. If there is anything... Here, so in other words, to that extent, Mr. Ruell, you are right. At the very end of the speech he comes back to the issue of impiety, and gives a new proof of his piety, namely, his refusal to commit perjury or to make other men... Incidentally, this is also the proof of Socrates' piety given by Xenophon in the first chapter of the Memorabilia. He gives all kinds of proof, that Socrates was sacrificing and praying and all the other things, and some other things, and then he comes to point to a fact which all knew, while the other things were not universally known, and that is that Socrates refused to commit perjury at the trial of the generals after the battle of the Arginusae, where Socrates said, "I will not perjure myself. Therefore I will obey the law and have each of the defendants judged by himself and not en bloc."

R: I was going to refer to that being hinted at in this telling of it. When he spoke of, "How I've always stood up for what was just," he also what was sound like "he possess".

S: Does he mention it there? R: Yes. S: It's easy to find. R: I do remember possess coming as... Socrates saying "holier than thou" to the whole city of Athens. A: 35d 1. S: 35. No, that is not the passage which Mr. Reinken means. No, and I think in the passage which you mean in 32a-b, there is nothing of possess. A: 32d. S: 32d. But that is not the battle of the Arginusae. That is the story of Leon of Salamis and the thirty tyrants. Well, that is minor. Yes?

Fielding: Would you comment? on the fact that in 34b he ends by re-emphasizing that Meletus is lying and that he is telling the truth, and the emphasis is on the reputation of his city following. That is to say,...

S: Do you mean the emphasis on Meletus, i.e., the non-emphasis on Anytus? Do you mean that?

Fielding: More the emphasis between truth-telling and...

S: That was the thing with which he began. And it's very good you bring up this question. You remember at the beginning he said the accusers haven't said, so to speak, a single true word. And now here he seems to make a distinction; I'm grateful to you, I had not observed that. Now he seems to make a distinction between Meletus, who is a proven liar, and Anytus, one of the other accusers where it is not proven, at least not in the court of law. That is indeed a point which

one should consider. And also later on there will be sons...Meletus is somehow singled out as the accuser, and whereas the two others, Anytus and Lycon, are pushed in the back, and they may have been more...especially Anytus may have been much more important than [Meletus?]. And we do not know in this way what precisely were the points made by Anytus in his speech. That is another handicap which we have, and which prevents us from judging with finality on what has happened there. Yea?

Q: In the first part where he says that the accusers
Socrates
says that the accusers proceed by slander and envy. What do you think about splitting up these two sections by saying that the first part, Socrates [remainder inaudible]?

S: But how? I mean how would you draw the line here?

A: Well, for instance, where he brings in the anthropos, the loud or the Mack.

S: All right.

A: That has a central position.

S: But what does it have to do with...I mean the distinction between slander and envy is very simple. There slander refers to the things said about Socrates, the untrue things said about Socrates. And envy would refer to the motive. And I don't see how this would apply. Here. You could find an application of it... No, no. I don't think that you can do...This distinction is perfectly intelligible itself but it doesn't find an expression in the organization, in the plan of that book.

A: Well what I was thinking of was that in the first part, Socrates asks Meletus if he thinks that he, Socrates, is worse than all the rest of the Athenians. S: Pardon? He is worse...A: He is worse...Meletus says that Socrates is worse than all the rest of the Athenians. He is the only one who corrupts them. S: Yes. A: What I was thinking of is that generally in the first part, Socrates says his accusers present him as being worse than all the Athenians, as a matter of fact, worse. S: But this comes...Yes. That is a slander. A: And that's the slander. And then when the anthropos comes on the scene, Socrates proves that he is at least as good as the other Athenians, because he stands in the field of battle. S: But on the other hand he showed throughout his criticisms of the accusers that he is in fact better than that. For example, that he is wiser because he knows that he knows nothing, whereas the others claim to know while knowing nothing. A: He is wiser, but then after the anthropos, after that scene, then Socrates goes on to say why he is better than everybody else. People actually...he has the reputation of being better than everybody else. S: Wiser, wiser they say. But I don't believe, to come back to the main point, I don't believe that this perfectly intelligible distinction between slander and envy, between the bad act and the motive of that bad act, has no...finds no expression in the plan of the Apology or any part of it. That's all I can say. To some extent it occurs when Socrates says the question, "Why am I accused of these things of which I am not guilty?" And then he says, well, the story of the Delphic Oracle

end what followed from that, and the debunking, and this is then the hatred following from the debunking, that is the motive leading to the slander that he corrupts the young, b) that he is impious. But this is not...I think we don't need it for...That is true. To that extent it is an important part. But it does not effect the plan of the whole. I can only repeat that.

Brusell: Does the fact that the corrupted young people want to avoid being stigmatized by being pointed out...S: Some of them. One cannot know. There may also have been others who were so angry at Socrates that they would like to take revenge. Brusell: But that doesn't explain why many would be ready to help him. S: Because they were corrupted. Brusell: But then if that's the case, then that refutes his earlier point that he...his disproof of the corruption charge to Melatus. S: No, I'm speaking now from the point of view of the Athenians, not from the point of view of Socrates. There might be...I mean Socrates is a corrupter, they say. Socrates might have been so successful in his corruption in some cases that the corrupted ones are happy through their corruption and therefore would have sympathy with their corrupter. That could be. There is no contradiction; it could be. Brusell: There's no contradiction here, but doesn't it ... earlier he had said, "I wouldn't be so foolish to corrupt those people who are around me because..." S: I see, oh this you mean. Yes. This is indeed a complicated...You mean just as a man doesn't educate his dog to become vicious to everyone, including himself, whereas as we all know the dog trainer will make the dog vicious to postmen and other strangers, but not to himself. Which would be a good example...And since this is also a famous Socratic example--Republic--one could say this is a refutation of this whole argument. It's not so simple. So in other words merely utilitarian considerations, on the lowest level, are perfectly compatible with corrupting the young. That's what you are driving at. Yes. Yes?

Q: I'm a little confused on one point. The view of the lout seems to find expression in common Athenian practice. S: Yes. In other words, the Athenians... Q: The Athenians on the one hand believe that disgrace is worse than death, and on the other hand they do not believe disgrace...S: Yes, that is true. You are quite right. But it is of course, in fairness to the Athenians we must say we all are guilty of such contradictions, you know? But they would not regard it as an act of courage to say, "I have committed this punishable offense and I take my punishment." I believe that this hasn't changed too much since. I mean you find more people who are brave on the battlefield than brave in this sense in the law courts. Don't you think so? Yes?

Q: Socrates has accused his judges of being a number of things. Is he now, in this last example, accusing them of being impious? Would they take this as another charge? S: I beg your pardon? Q: Would Socrates...Is Socrates now, in this last example, accusing his judges of being impious, at least in their past actions, in that they're willing to...? S: Yes, yes, yes. He turns it around. And he says, in other words, where it counts, the actions, he is more pious than they because he would not perjure himself and they would set perjury by their practice. Yes?

Fielding: It seems that if one compares the beginning and end of Socrates' first speech that there is a very subtle but significant change in emphasis. At the beginning he focuses on telling the truth and justice, but at the end he

focuses on reputation, that is, opinion, and justice.

S: Not only on reputation. He speaks very much so of reputation, but...and he devotes more space to the reputation than to justice. That is true.

Fielding: But I was wondering, at the beginning we have truth and justice and at the end we seem to have not so much that but opinion and justice, whether things might not have changed.

S: I see. That makes some sense what you say. But I would have to think it over. It is a suggestion which at least on the face of it is interesting. Yes?

Q: I would also be interested in understanding why reputation takes such a large place here and in relation particularly to the city, because earlier Socrates asks out those who have a reputation for wisdom in order to show them that they do not have wisdom, and this would have the effect, the negative effect on the reputation of Athens.

S: You mean this shows a concern for reputation whereas formerly he despises that. That's fundamentally what your predecessor said. Yes. And that is a point which has to be considered, whether this doesn't have something to do with that movement of Socrates' thought from the beginning to the end. That is surely worthy of consideration.

Q: I was wondering why you think he does bring up a thought that the judges may not have. In other words...

S: I know what you mean, namely, the thought that...he reminds them of the fact that he has not brought his kids to beg for mercy.

A: And then when he finally does...You see, at the bottom of page 123, "Now if any of you is so disposed--I do not think there is such a person," and then there's a few sentences about his children, and then he gets back to it and says, "But the opinion does prevail, I think, that some of you think I'm superior."

S: But this is in a somewhat different context. When he speaks of the reputation question he says, "People who...We all as good citizens are concerned with the reputation of the city. And most important in this respect is the conduct of those citizens who have a high reputation, whether deserved or not; they still owe something to the city." That's in a different context. Now as the first point to which you referred, that Socrates brings up something which aggravates his situation, namely, he underlines it that "I did not act as Pericles himself surely would have acted and anybody else, bring the kids to beg for mercy." One can give a simple answer to that, and that is that Socrates has promised more than once he will say the whole truth. And therefore he gives them all the evidence against him so that they can judge fairly. Well, but whether that is a sufficient answer, that is a question. There was someone else.

Q: I was going to ask if perhaps the turn to reputation here is a contrast to the original turn to reputation, and that there reputation is associated with seeing / virtuously? /, i.e., reputation is not conceived of as...is conceived of as a thing that should be founded on virtuous and proper way of action, and he's

underlining the difference between himself and others in that for him reputation is not founded on opinion but on...

S: No. Doxa means doxa. I mean surely that reputation is something not utterly negligible is of course something which every man of common sense says and Socrates would admit. But it is also not the most important thing, and is not something very reliable. Besides we have always to judge is the reputation deserved. I mean we have many occasions in our own life and wherever we look to make this distinction between deserved and undeserved reputation.

Q: Isn't that what he's trying to point to? It seems to me that's in a sense what Socrates is trying to point to.

S: Yes. Surely not all people make that distinction. To that extent one can say that, but otherwise I don't believe that there is such an emphasis on that. Good. Now we come now to the second part of Plato's Apology, and that is the so-called [antitmesis?]. Very briefly, Socrates...the jury decides guilty or not guilty. It has decided in the case of Socrates guilty. And they have proposed a certain punishment, death. And then, according to the then Athenian law, the defendant was entitled to make a counter-proposal on the basis of the fact that he is guilty, a counter proposal-proposal regarding the punishment. And this is the [antitmesis] which starts here at the end of 35 and goes up to 38b inclusively, and which is the central part of the whole work. And to that extent of special interest to those who believe in the special importance of what is in the center. Good. And which may be a superstition, but which nevertheless is something...My experience has convinced me that this is so. Good. Now let us...We can still read something.

R: "I am not grieved, men of Athens,...for not receiving a fifth part of the votes."

S: Well that is an obvious joke. It makes sense only when we assume there were 500 judges. And then there would be 280 for Socrates' condemnation and 220 against it. And he assumes that each of the three accusers is equally important; he divides 280 by 3, which is 93 or thereabouts. That would be less than a fifth of the minimum number which you would have to get, otherwise he would be fined as a frivolous accuser. So you see here Socrates continues to poke fun at Meletus, to treat him comically. And that is earlier, in 31d, we have said that Meletus treats Socrates comically by bringing in the daimonion, and making the daimonion of the indictment out of it. In fact, the man who treats comically here anybody is not Meletus, to say nothing of the other accusers, but Socrates, as will not be surprising to you. Yes. And you see...here this passage makes it clearer than any earlier passage, except the very beginning, that there were also speeches by Anytus and Lycon, and Socrates does not reply to them. And they may have had some interesting things to say, for all we know, about Alcibiades and Critias, and so on. And we have no Platonic Socratic answer to that. We have only Xenophon's answer. Now go on.

R: "And so the man proposes the penalty...in those activities and lives,..."

S: Now let us stop here. Now how did he say that second point after money-making? R: "Military offices, and,..." S: No, no. Before the military. Money-

making...R: "and property." S: "Management of the household." That is of some importance. Now Socrates replaces tacitly the question What punishment do I deserve? by the question What do I deserve? Because wishing to say the full truth, he cannot...the whole truth, he cannot say that he deserves punishment. He disregards the fact that he was found guilty of impiety, naturally. In order to establish what he deserves he gives a summary of what he did throughout his life. Throughout his life he neglected his oikos, his home, his family, and the polis, out of contempt. He was too good for these things. He translates it as "honourable," which is as a translation all right. But in more idiomatic English one would say he was "too good" for these things. More precisely, out of contempt for the generally held view that one must take care of one's household and engage in politics in order to be safe. Now when he spoke of his daemonion he had said that engaging in political life is a sure way to ruin. You will remember that. And now political life is presented as a way toward saving one's life. But there he had added that engaging in political life is a sure way to ruin if one wishes to act justly. This qualification is here of course omitted. Or one can perhaps also say, people engage in political life in order to save their lives, have good connections in the case of or a change of regimes, that in order to save their lives and fortunes, but they do not succeed. It is in other words a bad calculation. Socrates does not retract, then, what he said when speaking of his daemonion. But he makes two changes in this restatement. First, he expresses contempt for political life, which is much more than he said in the daemonion, where he simply said the daemonion keeps him back out of concern with Socrates. And secondly he enlarges the theme by extending it to the management of his household, and that includes of course not only money-making, which is here expressly distinguished, but taking care of his wife and his kids. So he regarded himself as too good for that. In the 18th century, someone who knew this source apparently quite well, wrote a dissertation in Latin with the title, Socrates nec Officius Maritus nec Laudandus Paterfamilias. Socrates was neither a dutiful husband nor a praiseworthy father of a family. And he gives lots of proof for that. That is of course a great question. Socrates' posture toward the city and toward his own family have many parallels. I gave you the example of Xanthippe before. Now this raises of course that Socrates is too good, which is of course also one of his many provocative remarks here in this speech. Still this remark that he is too good for the life of money-making or for taking care of such property as he had forces us to raise the question, what is the economic basis of his public spirited activity? One doesn't have to be a Marxist to raise this question; one only has to have a bit common sense. He presents himself as a pauper without any visible means of support, lives in ten thousand-fold poverty. Now how could he go on living if he didn't have...there was not something else. Now this question which is of course not raised either in the Marxist or in the anti-Marxist literature--because in this respect there is no difference between these two schools--is in fact answered if one reads it carefully enough in a work by Xenophon called Memorabilia, where Socrates is presented as a teacher of the art of managing one's household, he who never managed his household. And of course one is compelled to raise the question, since it is explained why Socrates explains the very powerful reason why one must take care of one's household. And he does this, by the way, to that good for nothing Critobulus, the son of Crito who is wasting his time by going to comedies and doing other things which don't bring him any money. But of course Critobulus' father was a very wealthy man and therefore it did not do him immediate harm. But then the question arises, What did Socrates live on? And I think if one reads the dialogue carefully one will find an answer to that. The

economic basis of Socrates' way of life. But I think you should find out for yourself and therefore I won't give you the answer. [Laughter] Yes.

Q: In this passage we have an example of Socrates talking big again. And you said earlier that Socratic irony was essentially dissimulation of one's wisdom, or concealing one's wisdom. S: Yes, but not always. Dissimulation of one's worth. Q: In one's worth. Well, I mean in Aristotle it's concealing one's virtue. S: That's the same as worth. Q: Here we have an example of Socrates bluntly, almost brutally, doing just the opposite.

S: Say, boasting. Yes. Sure. That is...This speech...Here he talks big. That's the word used by Xenophon. And I think that if one reads the Apology, one will...Plato's Apology, one will find he does talk big, and boast. But since Socrates was not a boaster--a boaster is always a low-class man--and Socrates gives us so many signs that he was not a low-class man, so that when he boasts it will not be mere boasting; it is something...I would say it is a provocation. And he wanted, apparently, to bring this issue to a decision, and not depending on any compassion, sentimentality, or what have you. And therefore he provoked this view. Whether this is not in a way, in a subtle way, suicide, you know? Because the stakes were so...That is a very long question. But I think that he provoked his judges is fair to say. But on another level one could say that what we call provocations--and I think rightly--is also saying the whole truth. Socrates did not regard himself...He regarded himself as worthy of the highest honor. Now this has nothing to do with boasting. I mean if we deserve the honor, the Aristotelian definition of the high minded man, a man claiming for himself high honors while deserving them.

Q: One further point. While he tacitly does not refute the charge that he does not believe in the gods of the city, he never goes so far as to say it in so many words that he does not...

S: Sure, but the question is why did he not do that? Is this...Again, is this an ignoble act of cowardice? Or is it something else? If two men do the same thing, it is not necessarily the same thing. And therefore one has to dig somewhat deeper. But surely the problem of Socrates is not so simple that a well-bred child of six will be able to fathom it. That is true. But I would say all moral questions of any importance go beyond the horizon of that well-bred child of six. Would you not admit that? And therefore I think we are only doing our duty to delve a bit deeper. Good.

I would like to come back for a moment to the question of the daimonion. Which doesn't mean that we will not come back to it again. Now the most important parallel to what Plato says about Socrates' daimonion is what Goethe says about the demonic, in German das Dämonische, especially in his autobiography, which in German is called Dichtung und Wahrheit--which may mean both Poetry and Truth and Fiction and Truth. So it is ambiguous. Now this autobiography may be said to culminate in a statement on this subject toward the end of the last book. There are important agreements between Goethe and Plato, but no less important disagreements. The disagreements must be understood in the light of the radical difference between Goethe and Plato. Goethe's friend Schiller said in a letter to Goethe, "The poet is the only true human being, and the best philosopher is only a caricature compared with him." Now Goethe himself would never have said that, but it was Goethe whose being induced Schiller to make this remark. Plato surely said the opposite, that the poet would be a kind of caricature of the philosopher, especially in the tenth book of the Republic / noise interference here / But is poet a sufficient description of Goethe? That would be a question. He was very much concerned with minerals, plants, animals, colors, and so on. One might be inclined to say Goethe was a thinker who was not a philosopher, whatever that may mean. As such he prepared Nietzsche, and that is a subject we will take up in the next quarter. The fundamental importance of this phenomenon is this: We are concerned with political philosophy. One cannot clarify what political philosophy is without clarity, none clarity, about what philosophy is. In order to achieve clarity about philosophy one must know the alternatives to philosophy. Now from Plato's point of view, the alternative to philosophy is poetry. He speaks of the feud between philosophy and poetry, in which he takes the side of philosophy, naturally. Therefore one--and especially today I think it is quite obvious, that for many of our contemporaries the human concerns which were formerly taken care of or thought to be taken care of by philosophy are in fact taken care of by poetry, so that poetry has taken the place of philosophy. And this has, incidentally, very much to do with Goethe himself. Now this in passing.

We have begun to consider the antithesis, Socrates' proposal--counter-proposal--as to the punishment. There was one passage which attracted our attention especially, 36a 7-b 1. This reminded us of the fact that was mentioned in the very beginning of the Apology that Meletus was not the only one who had made an accusation speech at Socrates' trial. Anytus and Lycon, the two other accusers, also did. But Socrates refutes only Meletus; by taking issue with him he does not take issue with Anytus and Lycon. What were the points made by Anytus and Lycon? We must be very curious... We don't know. Perhaps Alcibiades and Critias, as the proofs of Socrates' corrupting the young. There is another possibility which is mentioned by Xenophon in the second chapter of the Memorabilia, paragraph 9, ff. "But, by Zeus, the accuser / plural? / said..." Now here in passing, today it is regarded as known by divine revelation that this was of course not the accuser at the trial, but some fellow called Polycrates, who wrote a pamphlet called "Accusation of Socrates" a couple of years after Socrates' death. But that is a guess. Xenophon presents it as the statement of the accuser, i.e., of the accuser at the trial. "But by Zeus," the accuser said, 'he taught his companion to look down on the established laws by insisting on the folly of appointing public officials by lot when none would choose a pilot or builder or flutist by lot, nor any other craftsmen for work in which mistakes are far less disastrous than mistakes in statecraft. Such sayings,' the accuser said, 'led the young to despise the established

political order and made them inclined to violence, to revolution.⁸ But I hold that they who cultivate wisdom and think they will be able to guide the people in prudent policy never lapse into violence. They know that enmities and dangers are inseparable from violence, but persuasion produces the same results safely and amicably. For violence, by making its victims sensible of loss, rouses their hatred. But persuasion, by seeming to confer a favor, wins good will. It is not then cultivation of wisdom that leads to violent methods, but the possession of power without prudence. Besides, many supporters are necessary to him who ventures to use force, but he who can persuade needs no confederate, having confidence in his own unaided power of persuasion. And such a man has no occasion to shed blood, for who would rather take a man's life than have him a live and willing follower?⁹ That's all that Xenophon says on this subject. Xenophon refutes in this way the contention that Socrates induced his companions to engage in violent action. And perhaps the argument is quite good, I will not go into that now. But he does not say a word about another part of the accusation, namely? A: Impiety. S: That Socrates made his companions look down with contempt on the established polity. And therefore this would be a very good reason for disliking Socrates on the part of the establishment, and therefore also, on the proper occasion, for getting rid of him. Now this issue is not even alluded to--or perhaps it is once alluded to--in the Apology. Do you know where it is alluded to? A single passage. / Answer inaudible / What does he say there?

A: He says that if the Athenians had a law as they do elsewhere...

S: This is a criticism of one particular law, that is quite true. But the more important part...Well when Meletus says...Socrates asks Meletus...Socrates is the only one who corrupts the young. Who improves the young? And then Meletus says, "The laws." And then Socrates says, "But who is it who first knows the laws?" A somewhat strange formulation. What he means is of course, "Who makes the laws?" And if the laws are made by inept people, they may be more corrupting than Socrates or anybody else could be. So but otherwise the Apology is silent about it, and whether the Crito is silent about it we will see when we come to it.

Now Socrates has been found guilty. He is now supposed to say what punishment he thinks he deserves. Instead he answers first the question as to what he deserves. He begins by saying that he always regarded himself as too good for the economic and political life, meaning also for taking care of his household, i.e., his family. And he expresses his contempt for what almost all Athenians are concerned with. This was the point which we reached last time, and now let us continue. We turn now where we left, in 36b.../ noise interference /.

R: "...and thinking that I was really too honourable...his own perfection in goodness and wisdom..."

S: Now let us stop here for one moment. Now Socrates' political and economic activity would not have been of any use to the Athenians or to himself. He, as it were, retracts his expression of contempt. Not that he despises these things but he wouldn't have been good at them. And then his way of life consists in persuading each of them to be concerned with becoming good and sensible before taking care of his household, for example, and also of the city. Which is in practice a persuasion to poverty if it is taken literally. If they devote themselves to their improvement, how will they find the time for doing these morally neutral things

like earning money. Now let us go on here.

R: "...rather than for any of his belongings,...than for his interests,..."

S: That is also a...What does it mean to take care of the city itself, as a contradistinction of the things of the city? That's also not quite clear. But go on.

R: "...and to follow the same method...I propose maintenance in the prytaneum."

S: Yes. This is then Socrates' answer to the question. That is what he deserved. His proposal is based on the fact that he makes the Athenians in fact happy, blessed, which means of course that he makes them in fact virtuous. And then this difficulty arises, how can the Athenians be so ungrateful, i.e., so vicious, as to condemn that man to death? I use now against Socrates the argument that Socrates used against Pericles and others: if Pericles was a good statesman, then he made the Athenians better, and then they could never have caused any troubles to him, accused him and so on. Just...So in other words he claims by implication that his activity was entirely successful. He doesn't say that he tried to make them happy. This would be easy. But that he makes them happy. Just as the victors in the Olympian games were successful. Obviously, those who were running and not winning did not get any special honors. Yet he was not successful, as we know. He deserves that honor as little as the participants in the Olympian games who did not win. So that is a very interesting implication of what he says here.

Now there is a point which was made by Burnet here on 36c 7. Let me see. Burnet says here, "The affairs of the city"--you remember, that they should take care of the city first, and then of the things of the city--"these will be such things as national wealth and national glory." I don't take issue with Burnet for speaking of "national" wealth and so on when he speaks of a city, which is somewhat improper. Here we have in a nutshell the political theory of Socrates, which regards the concern with the city as in principle the same as the concern for oneself. The state which makes honor or wealth its subject is not the true state. That is just the doctrine of the Republic, which only makes explicit the pregnant hints of this sentence." Well this is not what we find here in the text. The distinction between the things of the city and the city itself is not identical with the distinction between external goods--wealth and glory--and the city itself. So that is somewhat obscure. Good. Now there is another point of Burnet, in d 7. "It should not be..." It is the passage about the prytaneum. "It should not be necessary to explain that the whole point is just that Socrates is making what the court would consider a monstrous claim,"--that is quite true--"and not applying for an old-age pension." That is quite true. But it is as monstrous as quite a few other things. Or to use a somewhat less harsh term, it is a great provocation. Socrates provokes the people all the time. He has to because, as he said, he will tell the whole truth. Now surely if he tells this whole truth then he is bound to hurt their feelings. Now let us go on here. We should first try to finish this section.

R: "Perhaps some of you think...lamenting and imploring,..."

S: Namely that he is too good for

. Yes?

R: "...I am speaking in a spirit of bravado;...only a little while."

S: I mention..."converse," that's the word for "dialogue". The whole Apology is a dialogue, a dialogue between Socrates and the city of Athens. The only dialogue of Socrates with the whole city. We must never forget that. That there was a dialogue narrowly considered between Socrates and Meletus, as you will remember, that is only a part of that dialogue. The whole speech is a dialogue. Now what can this mean? Well in a dialogue--in the Platonic sense of the word, at least--one necessarily adapts oneself, within the limits of the possible, to the man spoken to, to his moods, his capacity, etc. In that sense the Apology surely is a dialogue. Yes.

R: "I believe if you had a law,...you would be convinced;..."

S: Now let us stop here for one moment. We have here also a comment by Burnet to this passage. This is...The Spartans had such a law. He gives some evidence for that. And as another commentator says, the allusion to Spartan practice is "hardly politic." That is possible. But it is more important to know, as you observe, that this is a criticism of an Athenian law. And that we must keep in mind when we come to the Crito, where Socrates basins his principle that he must obey all Athenian laws on the fact that he has expressed his agreement to them. This is not so simply true, as we see here. Now?

R: "...but now it is not easy to rid you...will drive me out for their sakes." [e 2]

S: You see now the alternatives to the reward which Socrates proposed, because it is obviously highly improper after he was found guilty that he should be given a reward for his guilt. The alternatives are first, death, which is however not mentioned explicitly--he says "what Meletus has proposed"--prison, fine, exile. These are the three alternatives. As for the fine, he reduces it for the time being to prison, because he couldn't pay it and therefore he would remain in prison all the time. We will see very shortly afterward that Socrates makes a proposal of a fine eventually. But in connection with this strangely provocative character of this whole speech, he brings it only at the end. He could have avoided making the proposal that he should be fed in the prytaneum, and he also could have avoided this passage, and he could simply have said, "I propose as my fine money. I'm a poor man but these and these people will vouch for me." As he does at the end. But this he does not do, as we have seen. Now here the point which he makes here why exile is so unattractive, because he inevitably attracts the young, and thus arouses the hostility of their fathers and other relatives. Now let us see here, there is again another point made by Burnet which might help. "The young would follow him of their own accord. I do not understand the difficulties which have been raised about this sentence. It is in no way incompetent with the fact that many Athenian fathers were ready to give evidence in favor of Socrates to say that the elders of another city would resent his talking to their sons." Well, what do you say to that? The point is that Socrates doesn't say that other cities are worse or better than Athens. In Athens there were also...the majority of the fathers and relatives were also against Socrates, as you see. In other words, how many Athenian fathers and relatives were in favor of Socrates? There is a list given, which we have seen before in Me 7, ff., where there are altogether twelve people, which is not very much in a city of many, many thousands.

In other cities it is in a way worse, because in other cities he doesn't have some acquaintances from childhood on, family relations and so on. Hence exile is out of the question. In the Crito he will discuss the question of exile again, but that time it is the question of illegal exile, meaning running away from prison and from Athens. We must see how Socrates argues regarding exile there.

Now this statement about the old and the young. The young follow him, and it would be of no use to drive them away. And the old ones then would set against Socrates. Now I think one can say that in the Crito, as I hope to show later, an alternative is indicated but not followed up. What should Socrates do? I mean assuming that he would escape from prison illegally. He could go either to Thessaly, far away but a very wild country, very anarchic country. And then there life would be unpleasant because of the wild character of the life there. Or he could go to law-abiding cities nearby, like Thebes, but there he would be known as a fugitive from justice, which is not a good position to be in either. But then the question arises, could there not be a law-abiding city far away? And this condition is met by the island of Crete. Now Socrates then, if he had escaped from prison, he would have gone to Crete. And I believe this possibility, this very ironical possibility of course, is at the basis of Plato's Laws, where an old Athenian stranger has come to the island of Crete, and talks there to old men about the improvement of the Cretan laws. Now here we find this passage, which is...where the Athenian stranger says (I'll read to you, [see the? / translation): "Whether men are right or wrong in their [senses? / of the Laconian polity and the Cretan, that's another story. Anyhow, what is actually said by most men I probably am in a better position to state than either of you." The two others are an old Cretan and an old Spartan. "For in your case, your laws being wisely framed, one of the best of your laws will be that which enjoins that none of the youth shall inquire which laws are wrong and which are right, but all shall decuss in unison with one mouth and one voice that all are rightly established because they are divinely established and shall turn a deaf ear to anyone who says otherwise, and further that if any old man has any stricture to pass on any of your laws he must not utter such views in the presence of any young men, but before a magistrate or one of his own age. Well, there are no young people with us now. So we may be permitted by the lawgiver, old as we are, to discuss these matters among ourselves, privately, without offense." So there is a possibility of Socrates having gone away from Athens to converse only with old people and in the complete absence of any young ones. This only in passing. Good. And where were we now? Good. We come now to the final proposal.

R: "Perhaps someone might say,..." S: No, let us stop here. This phrase has occurred before. You may remember in 20c 4, he said "One of you might say." And in 26b 3, he says, "Someone might say." This "someone" was what you called the lout. And so let us see what this, what the bearing and purport of this objection is here. Yes?

R: "...Socrates, can you not go away...to make some of you believe."

S: In other words, this is again a cowardly proposal. A cowardly proposal, just as the proposal in 26b 3 was cowardly. Yes?

R: "For if I say that such conduct...and will not believe me:..."

S: "Will not believe me by regarding me as speaking ironically." Or, if you

want to be a bit more literal-- is the word "irony," all right--"by regarding me as dissembling." So in other words, Socrates addressing here the whole jury now, says that the judges regard the story of the Delphic Oracle as ironical, i.e., as untrue. Now let us here again see what Burnet has to say. "The words ειρων, ειρωνεια, ειρωνευμαι [ep?] are only used of Socrates by his opponents and have always an unfavorable meaning." I think that is in the main correct. "The ειρων is a man who shirks responsibility by sly excuses, such as the Socratic profession of ignorance." Now that is slightly...somewhat too narrow. "Observe that the court is not for a moment expected to take the oracle very seriously, though they knew well enough it had actually been delivered. Socrates is serious enough, but when he speaks of disobedience to God, he's really thinking of something very different from the oracle-mongering of Delphi." Now what do you say to that? Socrates' reference to the Delphic Oracle, of course, cannot be taken seriously. Oh, we know. But how does Burnet know that the judges knew that the Oracle had actually been delivered? You see the dogmatism here. How can he know that? There is no...The only evidence we have for that Oracle is here in the Apology. How can we know that, especially if Socrates had such a contempt for the Oracle as he says? Could he not...Champernon may have made a joke about it, and so that Socrates believed it, but could not also have...Socrates have made it up? It is an amazing way of arguing which we find here. So this is I think the strongest statement, making clear the irrelevance of the Delphic Oracle. "So it is no use," Socrates says, "that I would say that the god"--of course meaning Apollo--demands from him that he does not keep quiet but buttonholes everyone he meets the whole day. Now?

R: "...and if again I say that to talk every day...not easy to convince you."

S: Now here Socrates gives now the true reason why he can't keep quiet. The true reason for which the story of the Delphic Oracle is an exoteric substitute, necessary because incredible as the story of the Delphic Oracle is, it is more credible to the many than what Socrates says here. That it is the greatest good or at least a very great good for men to make every day speeches about virtue and the other things. Which other things we don't know. He adds immediately "about which you heard me converse." This is the true reason. It's a very great good for men to make speeches about virtue. Not to act virtuously. That's also a great good but not as great. Has to make speeches; why? Why can...making speeches about virtue seems to be an easy thing compared with acting virtuously. Why can Socrates nevertheless say it is a very great good to make speeches about virtue? Yes?

A: Well you'd be teaching virtue to other people and might endanger. It's really not that simple.

S: But perhaps it is more difficult to know the reasons for good acting than for acting well. Think of a nice kid who obeys his parents. Well, there is no intellectual effort required. He may have to overcome appetite, but that's all. But to understand the reasons, that requires a high intellectual effort. So in acting well a certain control of our passions is needed. But no exertion of the mind, of the intellect, and therefore it is higher, making speeches is higher. You see that when Socrates gives here this true statement about his life and the principle of his life, he does not say now that he examines everyone as he did, for example, in 36c 5. And he gives here also clearly the reason why he told the story of the Delphic Oracle. Because this true reason is still less credible to

then than the Delphic story. Now this clear juxtaposition of the story of the Delphic Oracle and the true reason occurs, as one might expect, in the central part of the Apology, because that is the most important point. Yes, let us complete this now.

R: "Besides, I am not accustomed...So I propose that penalty..."

S: Now let us here. Socrates returns now the question of what punishment he deserves, the only relevant question after he had been condemned, and the question that he had not answered before. He returns to it after he has made clear that his estimate of himself, and hence the proposal of the reward which followed from that estimate, is not intelligible to his judges. After he has made clear...You know, after all, the estimate that he deserves well of the Athenians is based either on the Delphic Oracle story, that he fulfills the mission imposed on him by Apollo, or on making the speeches about virtue and so on being a very great good, they are not intelligible to the Athenians and therefore he must now come back to the point. Yes?

R: "...but Plato here, man of Athens,...will be my sureties."

S: Yes. Now this, Burnet points out (I know very little about that thing), was a very large sum of money which he proposed. So there is nothing nasty in that proposal. But as I said he could have made this proposal right at the beginning of this part of the speech and then it would not have been provocative. These four men whom he mentions here are...were mentioned before when he spoke of the people connected with him and thinking highly of him. Plato, Critobulus and Apollodorus being young people and Crito being the father of Critobulus, a man of Socrates' own age. Now this story which we have here is important for understanding a section of Plato's Republic in the first book, when Socrates' discussion with Thrasymachus is an imitation of this scene. Because Thrasymachus, at a certain point of the discussion, says, "I want money from you, Socrates, if I'm going to teach you." And Socrates says, of course, "I ain't got no money," as he says here. And then at this moment Plato's brother, Glaucon, vouches for whatever Thrasymachus might demand. So there is a certain similarity between Thrasymachus' demand and what in fact the city demands. But this goes deeper, because what...Thrasymachus begins his discussion with Socrates by forbidding certain answers to the question of what is justice, just as here there are certain forbidden answers, which Socrates therefore may not give, namely, say that Apollo is not a true god, and so on and so on. But this only in passing. So we have now completed our reading of the central section of the Apology and we can now turn to the last section. Is there any question regarding this point now? Yes.

Schaeffer: How do we know that the offer to supply Socrates with the fine was not made until the very end of this part of the speech? Perhaps he kept speaking and finally these people decided to give him the money, but earlier he couldn't propose accepting the fine because he couldn't pay it.

S: Well there is no trace of any private conversation between Socrates and his friends. So this proposal, this proposal that they would vouch for him, must have been made before. They must have talked about what Socrates should propose. And that is simple. I think there is no trace of it. I mean the question whether this is a historical fact, that Plato and the others made this offer, is an-

answerable. We don't know. Also it doesn't make any difference, for the same reason for which something well invented is more...can be more instructive than the merely true, factually true. Yes?

Fielding: Is it not somewhat astounding that Socrates makes the claim that the youth in other cities will drive him out or persuade their fathers to drive him out if he does not converse with them?

S: Well, why does he do that?

Fielding: Well the first thing this brings to mind is that it indicates their devotion, or their attachment to...

S: This we know already. This we know, from Athens. But I think he says it in order to make clear how innocent he is. It's not his fault if they come. He is willing to drive them away but then it would have the same bad consequence for him then if he talks to them and the fathers get angry at him.

Fielding: Well could he not talk in such a way as to indicate to them that he could not talk with them? That is to say, could he not educate...

S: But still would they not also be angry in that case; if someone wants something from somebody else and he gives all kinds of apologies, excuses, the other fellow will still be disappointed, and maybe angry. That wouldn't help.

R: You have the Theages as an example where had to make a fairly elaborate escape, and the daimonion itself was a necessary...

S: Yes. Well this will work in some cases. But apparentlyⁱⁿ the case of Theages it worked, because it was a kind of brimstone rhetoric which was helpful there but which wouldn't help in other cases. They were from upstate. [Laughter] Yes.

Shulsky: In that section where he describes what would happen to him if he were exiled, he says that if he talks to the young men their fathers and relatives would drive him out for the sake of the young men. In other words, he's in a way replying to the fathers a somewhat better motive than he had done before. Before he said that the people who were once examined by the followers were made ashamed and...

S: That is true. I mean...Shulsky: Here he admits in a way that he is corrupting them. S: Well not corrupting them. But it is a point which Xenophon makes in a passage to which I referred earlier. The fathers were envious. The fathers want to be respected in their family; they want to be the authority at home. That's perfectly normal and necessary. But if some other fellow comes in and is looked up to by the sons more than the father, then you can understand that the fathers might not like it. It's a kind of jealousy. But jealousy can lead to all kinds of violence as you know, if not from life at least from the movies. Yes?

Q: How do you arrive at your positioning of this at the center? Numerically, or
?

S: No. It's very simple. First there is the speech of defense. And after

that is concluded there is a vote. And after the vote Socrates makes another speech about the degree of punishment, because that was not settled. And after this was settled the Athenians have to decide about the degree of punishment, whereupon Socrates makes another speech. One, two, three, in which the second is obviously in the center. It is not in terms of length in the center; that would be something else. Mr. Bloom? I'm sorry, Mr. . . . Olden times.

Q: I was just wondering why you said that the . . . about the thing of the city and the city itself doesn't refer to the . . .

S: But what...In other words, the city itself is the soul of the city. But still...All right, the question would arise here, how can you have a soul of the city if you do not have first a city? And I mean a city which is able to survive. I mean this has of course its parallels in the life of the individual; I'm aware of that. But this one could say. But there is a somewhat difficult implication in the thought--the city, in the sense of the soul of the city, as distinguished from its possessions, its honor, and so on and so on. For the very simple reason because the soul of the city would then be not merely the city but the regime, the regime. And this would lead then to the infinite questions of loyalty, because loyalty is not simply loyalty to the city, or to the country, but loyalty to the regime of the country. For example, a Communist might say, well, he is loyal to the United States, but only because of the promise which the United States holds out to become Communist. Well his plea of loyalty would not be recognized, and quite reasonably. Because in every time, and every country, loyalty means never loyalty to the mere country, the mere territory or anything else, but it means to the life-giving spirit, the regime. And therefore the city itself would then be the regime of the city, and this would lead to infinite questions in the case of Socrates precisely because he did not approve of the democracy as then understood--election by lot, and so on.

Q: Well then, could I ask what do you understand him to be referring to when he makes that distinction?

S: Perhaps he refers to the problem of the regime. But it is surely difficult passage, I would say. Yes.

Q: One thing I don't understand. In that part where he discusses what he deserves and he decides that it's free board in the town hall. Then you commented that really that somebody had to convince the Athenians, just as the athlete hadn't won the race, that really he didn't deserve that. How can those things be reconciled?

S: No well there are two different points. Let me make clear the one which you overlook. And that is that Socrates says he deserves this honor more than the victors at Olympia, because the victors at Olympia only make the Athenians apparently happy, whereas he makes them actually happy. But if he makes them actually happy that means he makes them...Socrates, he makes them actually virtuous. But this is of course not the case; otherwise they would not accuse and condemn him. And therefore he is not comparable to the victors at Olympia, who, however low that may be, at least achieve that low thing, whereas Socrates did not achieve that high thing as he himself admits. Therefore it is a particularly absurd proposal, and therefore particularly provocative proposal. If he had made the common sense, the

pedestrian proposal, a fairly high fine, vouched for by these wealthy men, there would have been nothing obnoxious about that and everything might be all right. But he did not do that. There is a lot of provocation throughout the work. And how to understand that is of course another matter. Yes?

Fielding: I'm sorry to ask the same question again, but it does seem that Socrates' comment about the youth here implies here that the Greek law proposed in the Laws won't work, namely, that old men will only talk with old men.

S: Why? Fielding: I mean that youth will break in. S: Oh no. That was not 1966 in the United States or Britain or any other country, but that was in the olden times [Laughter] when young people had to obey. And there was a simple practical means for that, that most people were dependent financially on their fathers. And as a very wise man once said, "This is no small tie." [Laughter] of children. Whether you can give more of your property to one child than to the other. You know who said that. A: Locke. S: Locke. And therefore you know today the young people earn money, they are financially independent; they may earn much more money than their poor parents. And therefore this fact alone changes the situation radically. In former times the influence lay with the older people--not necessarily the old--but with the older people, but by a kind of reasoning, with the oldest people. Very simply, if the good is the old, the traditional, then those nearest to the sources of the tradition, i.e., the oldest, are more respectable than those who have not yet been molded properly by the tradition. Elementary. And therefore this argument is of no help. And especially in these old fashioned Doric states--Sparta and Crete--the old had much greater authority than in Athens--you know, very sophisticated and very...and on the verge of disintegration. Yes?

Schaeffer: In the Republic Socrates waits to really discuss the nature of justice until...Socrates in the Republic waits until Cephalos has left before he really discusses the nature of...

S: That is not quite correct. Cephalos leaves. [Laughter] Socrates doesn't have to wait. Although he says he loves to listen to speeches, that bores him very much. He is an old man, and he prefers to bring his sacrifice--in plain English, to slaughter an animal so that they can have a dinner, which will not be given to the others who listen to the speeches. Socrates doesn't wait for him, but it so happened; that is one of these acts of chance in which the Platonic dialogues are so rich.

Schaeffer: But doesn't that imply that it would be very difficult to carry on what Socrates proposes in the Laws, which is to discuss the questions that he wants to discuss...

S: Yes, that's quite true. But that doesn't mean that Socrates has some good luck on his side. And perhaps because of his demonic character, his power of divination, he divined that old Cephalos would not stay long when they begin to discuss. That is very likely. That's likely. Now we come to the last part of the dialogue. Socrates' speech after he was condemned to death. Well, let's first read a bit, and then we'll see. The beginning.

R: "It is no long time,...to those who voted for my death."

S: Now let us stop here for one moment. And let us see first there are some remarks by Burnet. " agrees with , " two famous classical scholars, "that this third speech is pure fiction. He thinks that Socrates would not have been allowed to speak, and that the judges, especially those who had voted for his condemnation, would not have stayed to listen if he had. This contention appears to be groundless. Even in an ordinary case there must have been many formalities before a condemned man was finally handed over to the magistrates concerned, and this was not an ordinary case." and another point. "For no one had expected the death sentence." Now I think he is quite right against and [the scholars], saying that their contention is groundless. But he makes the same kind of mistake. How can he know that no one had expected the death sentence, on the basis of a purely hypothetical reconstruction of the political situation in 399? Generally speaking it is impossible to draw the line between truth and fiction in Plato's Apology, except such crude facts that Socrates was accused and was condemned, and this and this was roughly the content of the charge. But beyond that it is very hard to say. Burnet goes on: "I do not attach importance to the fact that Xenophon also makes Socrates deliver a speech after his condemnation, for that need only mean that he had read Plato's Apology. It does, however, show that he saw no impossibility in the situation, and he is as good a judge of that as and . " [Laughter] Very [generous?]. This favorable judgment on Xenophon here in Burnet is quite remarkable, because his general view of Xenophon is that Xenophon is a retired colonel, who didn't understand anything of philosophy and of Socrates' philosophy. And then he is of course confronted with the question, But how come that this particular colonel was so much attracted by Socrates? And then he gives a reason which refutes the whole position of Burnet in my opinion. He says he was attracted to Socrates because of Socrates' military reputation. [Laughter] Now, we know something about Socrates' military exploits, but all what we know about it we know from Plato, from the drunken Alcibiades' speech at the end of the Banquet, from certain remarks of Laches in the Laches, and so on. Xenophon doesn't say a word about Socrates' military exploits. If he had been that kind of man he would have indulged in that. And what is perhaps as important, in his...Xenophon gives twice lists of Socrates' virtues. Courage, manliness--and--never occurs in that. Now this doesn't mean that Socrates was not a courageous man, but it means courage and manliness as ordinarily understood was not a virtue of Socrates. Incidentally those lists of virtues are used here...a rule of reading which is important in the case of all very careful writers, namely, that, colloquially stated, it is important to read not only what is there but also what ain't there. Now in the case of Xenophon that is...for example, that is very simple because he gives lists, say, of virtues; and then when he speaks about a given individual you have to...he praises him very highly, you have only to see which virtues are omitted. Or to give an example which is most accessible at the beginning of his Expedition of Cyrus, the Anabasis, he says when they came, these soldiers, they came--his army--they came to a city that was big, inhabited, and happy, i.e., wealthy. And then he later on says that they came to another city that was big. Then you know already that it was not inhabited--the people had run away--and it was poor. In some cases he even says so, that the inhabitants had run away. But so that is the general principle on Xenophon, at any rate, is not to say...not to use words of blame; to be as nice in speaking about people as you can. Well there are limits to that. When he comes to speak of Meno, we have seen last quarter, then he can't use words of praise. Although this is a specialty of Xenophon. But the general thing, that one must also consider what is not said, what is absent, as much as what is present, applies of course to

Plato as well. So, Now this was...we have seen at the end of this speech, read by Mr. Reinken hitherto--read perhaps the last sentence again.

R: "I say this not to all of you, but to those who voted...something else to say."

S: Now wait. So in other words here Socrates makes clear that this part of the speech is addressed to Socrates' condemners. Here in the last part the Apology has a perfectly lucid plan, as it had in the first section as we have seen. The only difficulty was this section after the dialogue with Melitus. This is perfectly clear. Yes. Now what is the first point he makes now?

R: "Perhaps you think, gentleman,...In battles it is often plain that a..."

S: More literally, "For in battles, too,..."

R: "For in battles, too,...mercy of his pursuers;..."

S: In other words "in battles, too," because there you would all grant that one must not demean oneself. But before a law court you do not grant it.

R: "...and there are many other means of escaping...and I think they are well."

S: Now let us stop here. This is the central part of his speech addressed to his condemners. His point is here again the same which he made against that coward--the lout, as we called it--disgrace is worse than death. His sense of honor prevented him from appealing to the pity of the judges. His condemners were hurt by his pride, which showed itself especially in his proposal of punishment, namely, of a reward. They would have been appeased if he had disgraced himself by crawling before them. He does not say here that appealing to pity is an attempt to make his judges commit perjury, as he had said before. In a way he attracts here the very beginning of the Apology, namely, when he says "not for lack of words," "not for lack of speeches"--one should always translate here properly--. He could have spoken cleverly if he wanted. He could have deceived the Athenians. You may remember a discussion we had at the beginning whether Socrates could have spoken cleverly if he wanted, or whether he was unable. Here that is . He makes now a distinction between the condemners and the accusers, at the end of this speech. The disgrace falls less upon the followers, of course, than upon the leaders. Good. And now we come to the third and last part, addressed to the condemners.

R: "And now I wish to prophecy to you, O ye who have condemned me..."

S: "And now after this," in other words, a clear division. Then...Yes?

R: "...for I am now at the time...to you who condemned me I take my leave."

S: Yes. Socrates prophesies that out of his bones, at least out of his youthful followers, his avenger will come up--as a [Virgilian?] verse, "May there come an avenger out of my bones." Now we can imagine who this avenger of Socrates is, especially. What do you think? A: Plato. S: Plato. More than anybody else.

Now there is here an oath "By Zeus," as you have seen in 39c 5. Apart from that, which is the last oath in the book, there is nothing of the gods in the speech against the codemners, nor does he speak here of conversing with them. Good. And now at this point there begins a speech to the acquitters to which we must turn now. Unless you have a question. Yes?

Bolotin: You made the point a couple weeks ago about how important it was that Socrates was biologically very young. But here we see that he says he would have died very shortly.

S: Well, does this contradict each other? Bolotin: maybe not; I don't know.
S: Well we don't have a medical expert, but you are all scientists here.
[Laughter] Good. Apparently this goes together. Good.

R: "But with those who voted for my acquittal...wait with me so long, my friends;..."

S: he doesn't say "friends," -- "you men," Andres.

R: "...you men; for nothing prevents our chatting with each other while there is time."

S: Now let us stop here. So he would gladly converse with them, dialogesthai. But he will only what he translates "chatting." Diamytholoi. That is...just as the word for conversing, dialogesthai [goes to blackboard] is akin to logos, this word which he uses now, what he will do, is akin to mythos. So there will not be a logos here. He would love to converse with them, but somehow the occasion is not the right one. Instead there will be a kind of myth telling, even a reciprocal myth telling, in this section. One could say perhaps, with a view to this hyper, in e 1, for those who know Greek, no conversing in favor of the condemnation, but a telling of myth in favor of the condemnation, i.e., in favor of dying. And that is indeed what will happen here. Now?

R: "I feel that you are my friends,...I give you your right name--..."

S: Now this "judges" is the ordinary address to the jury, which he had never used before because he didn't recognize them as judges. But here in this case, in the case of the acquitters, he says they deserve to be called judges. Yes?

R: "...a wonderful thing has happened to me....prophetic monitor who always spoke to me very frequently..."

S: "The customary divination of the daimonion."

R: "...divination of the daimonion...but the divine sign did not oppose us..."

S: No. "The sign of the god," let us translate that way.

R: "...the sign of the god did not oppose...meet with something good."

S: And let us stop here. So here he identifies the daimonion with the sign of the god. And it is in favor of Socrates' dying. But this poses a difficulty because we have seen that the general function of the daimonion was rather to pre-

serve Socrates' life, whereas the Delphic Oracle of the god led Socrates without any compunction into mortal danger. Now the daimonion is identified here, as I said, with the sign of the god, i.e., the Oracle. There is no difficulty in here, as you will see by looking up again 33c 4-7. Now there is a point here where we can learn something again from Burnet. That is a point which Burnet makes frequently. He says, when he speaks of the daimonion, "We see clearly that only the nature of the consequences is in question, i.e., the moral questions are not decided by the daimonion, but only the expedient." Is it?

Q: Does it follow from this passage that Socrates had in fact courted death throughout the entire prison? S: I beg your pardon? [Question repeated] S: I simply cannot acoustically get... [repeated again]. S: Yes, in a way. In a way, yes. Yes. we must take this up on another occasion. Now, good. It has only to do with the consequences. All right. With matters of expediency, not of morality as you say today. But what is one of these effects of the daimonion, we see now, is that the daimonion sometime opposed itself to things Socrates was going to say, not only to actions--don't go there, and that meant he should go elsewhere, or stay here, don't stay here, means leave this place. But the daimonion prevented Socrates frequently from saying things with a view to the bad consequences of saying them. I see no difficulty in that, but I believe Burnet has not considered this point, that Socrates had in himself a regulator, as it were, preventing him from saying inexpedient things. Good. Yes.

Q: When he talks about the sign of the god, is the sign of the god the Delphic Oracle?

S: What else should it be? But it is not certain; it's not explicitly identified. If it were we have here the interesting case where both the Delphic Oracle and the daimonion agree. Now we will find an answer to that question later on in the Apology, but here it is an open question.

Bolotin: I don't understand what you're saying about the daimonion. Do you agree with Burnet's point? That the daimonion is concerned only with...

S: Yes. I indicated my disagreement by questioning the distinction between morality and expediency. I mean because that is not so simple to draw that line. Because we are supposed to act decently in the circumstances, and that always implies considerations of expediency. If you do the right thing in such a way that it will do harm and confuse other people, then perhaps you should not do it. I mean we are accustomed, especially in this country, to think in terms of the simple. Here is morality, and here is expediency. And if something is done for reasons of expediency some people think that it is not done decently. The older view that the consideration of the circumstances is as important as the overall principle which you follow. You know? And therefore expediency belongs very much to the moral consideration. You have a responsibility for those consequences which you can foresee, not for those which no one can foresee, but those which you can foresee. This is the meaning of prudence, still noticeable in our present use of the term. Good.

Now this was the first part of the speech to the accusers. Now we come to the second part.

R: "Let us consider in another way...that it is a good thing."

S: Namely, to dis, that Socrates dies. So now that's the second reason, "in the following manner." Yes. Now he proves that death is good, independently of the silence of the daimonion--that was the first argument. The daimonion did not prevent him from going to the courts; hence, it was good for him to go to the court and so on. And it also did not oppose his speeches which he made, and which were so provocative. After all the daimonion watching over Socrates' self preservation would have objected quite frequently. Nothing of the case. That was argument number one. Now we come to argument number two. Yes.

R: "For the state of death...of the soul from this to another place."

S: Now let us stop here. Now this disjunction is important. Either death is like being nothing, nor having any feeling--sense--of anything, or else the other alternative is transmigration to another place. Death as annihilation, as you will see, is not considered. That is considered is only lack of consciousness. There is also not considered--which is very important in a Platonic work--the possibility of metempsychosis, transmigration of the soul to another body. What is considered here only is the transmigration from here to there, i.e., to Hades. So the disjunction is by no means complete and when Socrates says at the beginning that he will say a myth, mythos, not a logos, that is quite correct, because it is not a logos, not strictly. Yes?

R: "And if it is unconsciousness,...all time seems to be no longer than one night."

S: Let us stop here. Now I said before Socrates does not consider simple annihilation, and hence also not whether fear of death as fear of annihilation is not...is not something very different from fear of such a condition, for example, or fear of Hades. Now this agreement...this argument here, which we just read, is in agreement with the view that human life is of no worth, of no worth. You remember what he said how low we are in regard to wisdom? And therefore not to have any activity, especially any activity of thinking, is a nice condition, can very well be a nice condition. Condition of being completely asleep. And you must also observe the use of the vulgar notion that the King of Persia is singularly happy, which is here presupposed, which is...Now what do you say about this argument? To spend an infinite or almost infinite time in dreamless sleep would be a wonderful and desirable condition. Is this in agreement with what Socrates has said earlier?

R: The supremely unexamined life.

S: Exactly. Now and even sleep occurs, the Athenians are ...Yes?

Q: Didn't he at one time criticize the Athenians for something like their being asleep?

S: Sure. And the godfly awakens them. Sure. Now this is not...Yes?

Q: Are we not to make a distinction between the Athenians being supposedly alive and this being a state of death? So that sleep may be necessarily for one who is , but it is hardly for one who is alive. For one who is dead it may not necessarily be so.

S: But still compared with living, with being alive, the question is, What is

better, to be alive or dead? And then if being dead means to be in a condition of a dreamless sleep, then the question is whether a dreamless sleep of very long or infinite duration is not better to a state of being awake. That is the question.

Q: Could then it be possible that somebody might envision a state of sleep and death as being much better than living, if living is defined, in this case by the Athenians as well, as a kind of sleep, too. S: Defined by the Athenians?

Q: I think Socrates is faced here with two alternatives. Either he has to live or he has to die. Living for him, to live he must conform with the limits set down by the Athenians. And this is to be asleep while being alive.

S: But not quite. Because he was very much awake. He tried to make the Athenians awake, and that led to his downfall, to his death. Surely one must consider that question whether a state of complete dormancy is not better than a state of living--surely. But the question which we can simply answer is only this, Did Socrates possibly believe that? And the answer on the basis of this Apology is, No, Socrates regarded a life of self-examination as better than a dreamless sleep, short or long. And therefore Socrates gives another alternative, which we cannot discuss now. Death is either sleepless dream--wonderful, even the King of Persia would prefer it to his greatest banquets and so on. And then the alternative means that it is going to another place, i.e., to Hades. And then Socrates says even that is preferable to life, for reasons which he will state in the sequel. But we will take up this next time.

The structure of the Apology as a whole is by now clear. It consists obviously of three main parts. Altogether the plan is very clear, as is becoming for a public speech. Except in the section following the refutation of Meletus, as we have seen. This section was the one which leads up to Socrates' daimonion and therewith to the question of the relation between the daimonion and the Delphic Oracle. In the central speech the relation between the daimonion and the Delphic Oracle is almost explicitly discussed. When Socrates raises again the question Why...or presents himself as being asked the question, Why can't you keep quiet? And he gives two answers: the divine mission, i.e., the Delphic Oracle, compels him to be a busybody. But this answer is regarded by the judges as ironic, and therefore as of no use. And the second answer, which is the true reason, the greatest good for man is to examine himself and others, and the unexamined life is not worth living. This means--although the word is not used here--this examining is the greatest good for man by nature. Now we have seen the connection between the daimonion and eros and physis, and positively expressed Socrates' eros, his daimonion is directed toward the greatest good. What man as man by nature seeks, although it comes into its own only in a very few men. A commentary on that is given in the first book of Aristotle's metaphysics: "All men desire by nature to know." As is shown in vulgar curiosity, even. And yet...But this natural desire to know has various forms, various stages, and in its highest stages it's philosophy. But owing to the fact that human nature is enslaved in many ways, as Aristotle puts it--the needs of all kinds, and the troubles of all kinds--so that only a very few, the , or the good natures, are capable of philosophy. The two reasons given by Socrates, the one referring to the Delphic Oracle and the other referring to what is by nature the greatest good, are incredible to the many as Socrates says. But the reason taken from the Delphic Oracle, while incredible, is more intelligible to the many than the true ground. And therefore that is a good enough reason to use this as a basis in his presentation. It is important to see that this exoteric reason, the reason taken from the Delphic Oracle and its consequences, too is "heretical," at least...not in the sense that it is a punishable offense, but not credible, deviating from what is generally accepted.

Now the third and last speech, the speech after the condemnation to death, has again a clear plan. Socrates speaks first to the condemners, and then to his acquitters. We have completed the discussion of that speech to the condemners. To the acquitters he makes the following point: Death is good. And the first reason given is the silence of his daimonion, and this proves of course only that death is good for Socrates. The second is a general reason--death is good simply. And the first reason given is...and the general argument is this: Death is either a dreamless sleep or a migration toward another place. If it is a dreamless sleep it is obviously better than life, as even the Persian King with all his pomp and pleasures would admit, because even he will suffer so much during his life. For example if he sits too much, as he is likely to do, and so on. Now we come now to the second alternative, which begins in 40c 4-6.

R: Page 143. "But on the other hand, if death is,...that all the dead are there,..."

S: Now let us stop here for one moment. The other alternative, which he begins now--all the dead go to Hades. That in a way goes without saying because in the first case also all the dead would be in a state of complete coma, complete thought-

lessness, and what is more desirable than such a condition, according to this argument here. Yes?

R: "...what greater blessing could there be, judges?...reaches the other world,..."

S: "Having arrived in Hades," let us be a bit more...

R: "...having arrived in Hades,...of habitation be undesirable?"

S: Now let us stop here. Hades is of course superior, Socrates says, to life in Athens, or on earth, because the judges there are superior, and therefore the situation would be better. Now but he does not make clear one point, although he implies it. Hades is attractive only for those who have lived here justly, because the others would be worse off under perfect judges. You note the repeated emphasis on that these are things which are said, i.e., Socrates in a way disclaims to know, but these are possible things based on myths. Yes. As he said at the very beginning when he said he will diamythologai with them, not dialogesthai. Yes. Now go on.

R: "Or again, what would any of you give...if these things are true..."

S: Yes, now you see here another group of four men mentioned by name. It so happens that these four are criticized in the Republic, 364c-e, because they teach that the gods are unjust, and in particular that they can be bribed; in other words they are not good judges. Yet Socrates prefers their company to the company of the men here. Yes?

R: "...for I personally should find the life...that would not be unpleasant."

S: This expression "not unpleasant" which occurred when he spoke of his examining people in Athens, that this was not unpleasant to him or the young men. Here we have a group of two, Palamedes and Ajax, the son of Telamon, and they are Socrates' equals, because they are in the same boat as he--unjustly condemned. The first two groups, I infer for the time being, were superior to Socrates. The first four obviously because they are demi-gods, and also Homer and Hesiod, Orpheus and Musaeus could plausibly be said to be superior to Socrates. At any rate this would correspond to the views of the addressees. Yes?

R: "And the greatest pleasure would be to pass my time..."

S: Not "the pleasure." "And the most important thing," to megiston.

R: "And the most important thing would be...in other respects than men are here."

S: So. Now the chief reason--and that is the meaning of the word to megiston, which he translates wrongly--the chief reason why Hades is a nice place, Socrates can continue there the life he led in Athens, and improve on it by examining not ordinary men but also these famous men of the past, heroes and heroines of old. He mentions here also the women. We have no...He didn't say anything of his examining women in Athens, which is quite remarkable. And of course there is

no punishment for examining in Hades, and especially not capital punishment because they are all immortal there. Now here we have another group of men, the one who led the army against Troy—who is that? R: Agamemnon. S: ~~Yes~~. But he is not mentioned by name. And why he doesn't do it is a question. But let us see what is the consequence of that. Altogether 12 beings--men or demi-gods--are mentioned by name. One can say that Socrates did not mention Agamemnon because Agamemnon...with a view to his own model, the greatest protagonist of Agamemnon was Achilles, and Achilles who said that in Hades that it is better to be alive as a poor man's serf than to be king in Hades. Now when we look...why does he make this selection? A partial answer we can derive from the fact that there was an earlier enumeration of men in the *Apology*, in 33b-34a. If you will return for a moment to this passage. There Socrates mentions the people who would testify to Socrates' not having been a corrupter of the young, a list which begins with Crito and ends with Apollodorus. Now if we make here...these are of course not 12 but altogether 17 names. But those still alive are 12. Let us figure it out again. "Crito here, the father of Critobulna here"--two. Then "Iysanias of Sphettos, the father of Aeschines here"--four. Then "Antiphon here, the father of Epigenes"--six. And then Nicostratus, the father of Theodotus, but Theodotus is dead, so we have only seven. And then Paralus, whose brother was Theages, so we have eight. And then we have Adimantus, Plato, Aesiodorus, and Apollodorus. There are altogether 12. This I think the fact is undeniable. But whether it is helpful is another matter. [Laughter] No, that is clear. One must, I suppose in all branches of knowledge, observe facts, and facts are not by themselves enlightening. They say be brute facts. And here...But let us generalize a bit. These are 12, in each case--a dozen. The company of which dozen is preferable? Of the 12 here, Crito and Apollodorus and Plato, of course--or the company mentioned later on, the company in Hades? That surely would be the question, would it not? And to that extent I believe the fact that there are two dozens is helpful. Well I will not... I mean most of you will regard it as frivolous when I say --but I say it nevertheless--that in the first list, in the list of the people who know Socrates here in Athens, the second from the end of the young people, possible victims of Socrates' corruption, is Plato, and the second from the end in the second list is Odysseus. Now that Plato should have some Odyssean characteristics is not in accordance with the commonly accepted view, but I think it is in accordance with the facts as presented by Plato himself. But regard this as an entirely otiose and frivolous suggestion. Good. So we are now through with the speech of Socrates to the acquitters, to his friends. Now Socrates does something very strange. Yes?

R: "But you also, judges,...and be freed from troubles."

S: The emphasis is altogether put on the word "now." So this is the third point which Socrates makes to the condemnere. I made a slip before. Death is not bad for a good man. He speaks strangely of male human beings, after having spoken of women in the other context. Death is not bad for a good man because of divine providence. Third argument. The harmony between divina providence and the daimonion and between the Delphic Oracle and the daimonion is now established. Death is now good for Socrates, which does...In other words formerly, say ten years before, it would not have been good for him. He would have been more useful in Athens. Good. Yes?

R: "That is the reason why the sign never interfered with me,..."

S: Oh, I'm sorry. We should have...I...My remark referred to this sentence. Yes?

R: "That is the reason why the sign never interfered with me,...or with my accusers."

S: So in other words this is...There is perfect harmony between the acts of the gods, providence which they exert, and Socrates' daimonion regarding its being better for Socrates to die now. Formerly there was a possible conflict because Apollo's Oracles, according to Socrates' description, led him to endanger his life whereas the daimonion was concerned with Socrates' preserving his life and therefore kept him back politics. Yes.

R: "And yet it was not with that in view...is known to none but the god."

S: Yes. Now Socrates turns now very surprisingly again to his condemnors. And so we have this structure of the last part of the Apology: The speech to his acquitters is surrounded on both sides by speeches to the condemnors. Socrates, very strangely, treats his condemnors—you must have observed again that he uses the second person plural--treats his condemnors as his spiritual heirs, as heirs to his mission. He expects them to be the benefactors of his sons as they were his benefactors by condemning him to death now. He does not entrust this function to his acquitters but to his condemnors. Now at the end of this passage Socrates makes again clear that he does not know whether death is preferable to life. That he had said before and this was somewhat over/laid? by his mythical story in his speech to the acquitters. You remember, previously he had said that if someone fears death he claims to know what he does not know, and therefore it is unreasonable to fear death. Death may be better than life, but we don't know. At the end he returns to this proposition. Now this is...We have now reached the end of our discussion of the Apology, and I would like to make a few points in conclusion.

There is one point which refers to a special difficulty, but which I have not stated I believe with sufficient clarity before. The first accusers, Socrates says, did not accuse him of impiety. That Socrates was impious was an inference of the listeners. And the basis of the charge of the first accusers were rumors on Socrates' physiology and rhetoric. But on the other hand he says the first accusers did accuse Socrates of impiety. And the basis of the charge was ultimately the Delphic Oracle, which induced Socrates to debunk the would-be wise man in Athens, and he was imitated therein by the young people, and then these debunked people said "Socrates corrupts the young." And then in their embarrassment to answer the question, "By doing what does he corrupt the young?" they said, "Because of his impiety," or "By instilling piety in them." But there is a clear contradiction. The first accusers did not and they did accuse Socrates of impiety. The present accusers did accuse Socrates of impiety; that appears clearly from the indictment. But the basis of their charge, as comes out later on, is what Socrates said about his daimonion, which is something different from the rumors about his being a physiologist and from the story about the Delphic Oracle and its consequences.

Now I have said on another occasion that in reading books as carefully worded

as those by Plato, it is important to consider not only what is mentioned but also what is not mentioned. I gave an example, or examples from Xenophon last time. Now in Plato... And the example I used from Xenophon was his lists of virtues, and which virtue does he not ascribe to Socrates. Now the best known list of virtues in Plato is that within the Republic, the so-called four cardinal virtues. Which are they? Pardon? Good. Wisdom, justice, temperance, fortitude. S: Yes. Now which is not mentioned in the Apology? And if my reading is correct--in such cases it is always necessary to check and counter-check--moderation is not mentioned. Whereas the three others are mentioned. Now does it make sense that it is not mentioned in the Apology? What is moderation? According to the definition given in the Charmides, 151b, moderation consists in minding one's own business. And this makes sense here. In 31b 3 Socrates says, "I always mind your business. And therefore if he always minds their business it is hard to see at first glance how he could ever mind his own business. But this is of course not sufficient because a little bit later in 33a he says...he admits the young people observe him minding his business. So examining the Athenians. Now there is another and more plausible view of moderation is given by Aristotle in the Ethics, and it is also sometimes used in Plato, where moderation means [sounds like "immoderate." Perhaps "a moderate" / indulgence of food, drink, and other sensual pleasures. This is, one can say, the most plausible meaning. Xenophon, however, calls this virtue not moderation--sophrosyne--but [sounds like "encretes"/], which we can translate by self control. Perhaps the most important Platonic statement on moderation occurs in the dialogue Phaedrus, which is devoted to a certain kind of speeches, namely, erotic speeches. And accordingly it is divided into two parts, first, eros, and b) speeches--logos, rhetoric. Now in the section on eros we have first a praise of moderate eros, which is then...by Socrates, which is then retracted. And then we have a praise of manikos eros, of immoderate, mad eros. The highest form of that manic eros is philosophy. But philosophy means the attempt to discover the truth, to think. Moderation comes in as far as speech, especially public speech is concerned; that is its proper place. Moderation is also opposed to hybris, to insolence. And a good example of insolence is of course Socrates' judgment on what he deserves after he had been declared to be guilty. And he declares himself worthy of the highest honor. That is, in the language of Aristotle, the sign of a magnanimous, of a high minded man. Being worthy of the highest honors, claiming them. Now in his Ethics Aristotle says, and that is of some importance,...So in other words it makes sense to describe Socrates of the Apology, and not only of the Apology but especially of the Apology, as magnanimous. And there was a thesis written many years ago, 40 years ago, by a pupil of Werner Jaeger, Wolf, in German, which tried to show this point, and to that extent it was a sound study. Now Aristotle says in his Ethics that the high-minded man is not given to praise, because of his very high standards he doesn't find much to praise. Nor is he a man who speaks evil of other men, because that is beneath him. He doesn't even speak evil of his enemies, unless out of insolence. So a certain insolence is compatible with high-mindedness. And in his Rhetoric, Book II, chapter 12, Socrates gives this definition of eutrapelia, wittiness in a very high sense. It is educated insolence. In idiomatic English we would perhaps say, unvillified insolence. And something of this kind Socrates shows indeed in the Apology [with particular sophrosyne from the Apology is not wholly unintelligible. Socrates does not appear here as sophron, as moderate as it is mostly understood. Now this is all I have to say about the Apology. And we turn then to the Crito. But I suppose we have some time...Can we synchronize our watches? That's about correct? We can have a few...

a brief discussion.

R: Your first point simply established a contradiction and offered no clue for its resolution.

S: I beg your pardon? R: Your first minor point was that there is a contradiction as to whether the first accusers accused of impiety or not.

S: Yes. Well we discussed that at some length. We discussed it at some length. I mean and the point is of course...Well there is a solution given in Plato himself in the Phaedo where Socrates, on the day of his death, says to his friends that in his youth he was a physiologist. And therefore the rumors about his being a physiologist, which led to the suspicion of him, had a basis in fact. Now the great question of course is whether Socrates turned away from physiology, say when he was 22, or when he was 32, or whether the old Socrates properly understood was still a physiologist, although no longer a so-called pre-Socratic; this he surely was not. But for example in the Gorgias, Socrates gives a sketch of a geometric cosmology as the basis of his teaching regarding justice, which is of course also physiologia. And this Platonic doctrine of the cosmos, of the ideas, is naturally also a physiology. That is...So I would say the rumors regarding Socrates' physiologia were not...were by no means unfounded, as even Burnet admits. Only he likes to contradict himself, although not for Plato's or Socrates' reason. I mean his contradictions were not known to him when he made them. Yes.

Wolfowitz: You mentioned that Socrates doesn't refer explicitly to the charges that Xenophon mentions as having been brought, that he taught the youths to not have respect for the laws of the city, but that he alludes to it in his conversation with Meletus where he asks Meletus if he is the only one who corrupts. S: But it is a very thin allusion. One has to do some thinking about it in order to see that. Wolfowitz: Is there a similar allusion to this in the conversation with Euenus in 20d, where he argues with Euenus that he should send his son to someone... S: You mean with Callias. Wolfowitz: Callias. Right. And Callias says that he sends his son to Euenus.

S: No, what has this to do with the laws? After all there was no legal prohibition against having your son taught "culture."

Wolfowitz: But Socrates says that you wouldn't let any old person teach your son the things he needs for excellence as a man, just as you wouldn't...

S: Now to which passage...Is this...Wolfowitz: 20d. S: 20d. That is beyond that. No, you mean probably 20...before. But is there any reference to it being forbidden to educate human beings, which is exactly what Euenus is doing? Wolfowitz: No, but isn't he arguing in a sense trying to convince the man that only a few people are able to educate human beings to be good citizens? S: But that is in no way...I would say in no way made explicit. You can say that it is also not made explicit in this passage to which I refer. And I reply as follows: In this passage to which I referred is obscure. This here is in no way obscure. There Meletus had said the laws are the ones which improve the young. And then Socrates says, "No, I don't mean that; I mean who are those who first know the laws?" This is an obscure utterance. And of course a moment's reflection would tell him that he refers to the fact that the laws as laws are ineffective if they

are not executed by human beings. But between...there is a great difference between executing the laws and knowing the laws. Because people may know the laws and not execute them. And therefore we come back eventually to this point, that before the laws can be executed they must have been established. And this establishing of the laws is of course in a way knowing the laws, namely, first in the state of bills on which they [been decided?]. So here the darkness of the utterance is a proper reason for looking into the problem, and then one finds...one discovers the problem of the laws implied here. But in this passage about Callias there is no such inducement. In a way you can say by adducing parallels that the mere fact that only a few people claim to teach the young shows that this is a...the majority cannot educate the young. But to which the argument is obvious. Socrates doesn't grant that Euthydemus and this sophist be mentioned there are good at educating the young. Therefore that is wholly beside the point. Mr. Ladd?

Ladd: Yes, I have three questions. S: Well, state them one by one. Ladd: Xenophon appears to defend Socrates against the charge that he was insolent in speech by saying that he thought his time to die had come. In other words, that it was fitting for him to talk big, he insolent, because he wanted to make sure that he would be condemned.

S: In other words Socrates' death is a kind of suicide, and a kind of suicide deliberately chosen so that it has a salutary effect. Namely that the Athenians kill him, and thus will come to their senses afterward. That is I think

. Sure. Now this is not...Plato makes no such statement. On the contrary the Platonic Socrates in the Phaedo the day of his death gives a long argument against suicide as incompatible with belief in Providence. If gods watch us and take care of us, then it is a running away from their guardianship if we try to kill ourselves. Although there is a certain difficulty here because the gods of course exert providence also in Hades. But still, he takes this view that man is put here by the gods and cannot dispose of his life as he pleases, however good or seemingly good his [thesis?] may be. But in Xenophon this is suggested. But this...You see the point. That leads to a long question to which I have alluded, the whole question of what is the principle of Xenophon's presentation in contradistinction to Plato's, and this cannot be disposed of as Burnet does. You know, the cavalry captain who for some strange reason was interested in Socrates. Xenophon speaks of the immortality question, but characteristically not in his Socratic writings, but in his Education of Cyrus. So in other words Xenophon was familiar with this point of view but he did not ascribe it to Socrates. Why, one would have to go...I couldn't answer in a short...now.

Ladd: Xenophon seems to think, or leads you to think, that if Socrates had not talked big, it's not so clear that he would have been condemned. In other words,...

S: Yes. That is perfectly compatible with Plato's account, at least to that extent that the majority was very small, according to Plato. And it is perfectly possible that thirty of the judges would have voted differently if Socrates had behaved in the ordinary manner, I mean bringing up his kids and appealing to the compassion of the judges and at least avoiding anything which would hurt their feelings, you know? For example his proposal that he should be given board in the *prytaneum*, and other things. Now this was only one of your questions.

London: Yes, I have another sort of strange question. When Socrates implies that his audience doesn't believe the story of the Delphic Oracle, are we to understand that this is characteristic of this new, sophisticated Athens that they don't believe this kind of story, or that it's true of all...?

S: Oh, no. Let us be careful and let us also not trust implicitly Burnet's view of the anti-Delphic posture of the Athenians because Delphi had sided with the Persians in the Persian wars, and so on. But let us stick to what we see here immediately. They did not believe that that which was behind Socrates' whole way of life was the Delphic Oracle. That's the point. And the fact that... Well, of course Chaerephon was dead, the one who had asked for the Oracle. His brother could vouch for it but whether his brother would have been a reliable witness in the eyes of the Athenians, whether he would not seem too much attached to Socrates, for example, that's impossible to say. Let us not draw any further conclusion. I think the Athenians would not have condemned Socrates if they had not believed, or the majority of them had not believed, that it is important for the city that the gods of the city be recognized, i.e., that their existence be recognized. And of course they also be properly worshipped [in cult?]. And that they were sure that Socrates did not do that. Athens was not a liberal society. And the view that she was is based chiefly, I think, on the funeral speech of Pericles in Thucydides, which is a particularly flattering statement about Athens, and you only have to read in the same Thucydides how the Athenians behaved in 415--you know when the Hermæ were mutilated, and this persecution of guilty and innocent alike without any legal safeguards whatever being observed. One would have to know that in order to see that Athens was not in fact liberal. Now as far as the principle is concerned and not merely factual liberality, the view that recognition of the gods of the city is the duty of every citizen and the neglect of that duty is a punishable offense--I use a criminal offense--was... I mean a liberal society in our modern sense according to which opinions and even speeches are perfectly uncontrollable by law didn't exist. That came out in a very complex way. The external mechanism was the religious persecutions and wars of the 16th-17th centuries, when people tried to find a kind of security against religious persecution. Therefore toleration became established, and then in a later movement toleration was extended not only to religious convictions and speeches stemming from honest religious convictions, but to any convictions, and to any speeches, so much so that we know that there are contemporaries who say that even a grossly obscene speech is protected by the first amendment. You may have heard of that story. It was not at the University of Chicago but another University. So this... I mean a right to freedom of speech, and especially an unqualified right, didn't exist. And therefore... and Socrates did not fight for it. The modern interpreters who admire Socrates, or rather let us say the modern journalists, who admire Socrates because he is such a defender of freedom of speech, they have no basis in Socrates. And you can say Socrates' recurrence to the Oracle of Delphi proves that it was necessary for him, in a way, to have a kind of divine sanction, special divine sanction, for his activity. You know? So little was there a recognition of the right of speech as such. Socrates says somewhere, "There is no freedom of speech in Athens except in the assembly of the people for the orators," because there it was a special situation, "and on the comic stage," because there was great frivolity and freedom was granted there on that special occasion. But even the comic poets got into troubles, if, for example Aristophanes when he attacked Cleon in his comedies he got into troubles for that. But this was a kind of

. carnivals freedom, you can say, which didn't have in itself any political importance, or at least was meant to. Question number three!

Loudow: Yes. It appears in the list, in the final list, that I guess if you include the reference to Agamemnon, that Hesiod rather than Homer is... S: Pardon! Loudow: It appears that Hesiod rather than Homer is... S: Yes, yes, I that. [Loudow's brief question here is inaudible] Well this would mean, again, that in this context Hesiod would be the most important. In order to answer that question there is a very simple way. Study Hesiod. [Laughter]

Fielding: You described philosophy as being concerned with discovering truth and with thought, with thinking. And yet in the Apology Socrates seems to emphasize the examination of man for the purpose of showing that they are not wise. And to encourage them to care for virtue. And I was wondering whether you see a harmony of these views in the Apology.

S: Well in the Apology that is hard, perhaps. And you know because of that ... it is a public speech. But these assertions themselves are compatible. Now let us start with the most, apparently the most, simple, that Socrates was trying every way, as he put it like a "gadfly," to admonish every Athenian to be concerned with his virtue. Yes? Good. What... Sure. But then what is virtue? Now this question is... We know many people who admonish others to be virtuous without necessarily raising the question What is virtue? But I believe Socrates would not fail to raise this question, because he is famous for being the one who has discovered, as it were, that What is? questions, the questions aiming at definitions and especially with a view to virtue. So Socrates then would raise the question, What is virtue? Or has raised it before he admonishes people to virtue. And must have answered it to some extent because otherwise how could he admonish people to be virtuous if he did not know what virtue is to some extent? But let us assume that his knowledge of what virtue is is not complete. In that case he would be also ignorant of virtue, as well as he is aware of virtue, you know? And he would know that he is ignorant. And that would mean, with a slight exaggeration, that he knows that he knows nothing. And that this knowledge of his ignorance is what distinguishes him from all his fellows in Athens and elsewhere. And now if we start from the last point, knowledge of his ignorance is impossible without knowledge of what you are ignorant, because if someone is ignorant of the amount someone has in the bank and no one would cull him an ignorant man. One would say only he is minding his own business and is not improperly concerned with other people's private matters. Knowledge of ignorance means knowledge of ignorance regarding the most important things. So one would have to know at least what are the most important things. And one would also have to know what knowledge is. So knowledge of ignorance includes quite a bit. And since it necessarily... knowledge of ignorance is concerned with overcoming that ignorance as far as one is able, it means to philosophize. That is the same. To that extent the Apology I think quite clear regarding Socrates. That he presents it, presents philosophy--especially in the first part--as very low, only the slight difference that the philosopher is not a man who boasts, whereas the others are boasters, and not to be a boaster is not something very grave. It is better than to be a boaster, by all means, but if someone doesn't boast and has nothing to boast of, it's also nothing very [great] or grave? But he transcends that, as we have seen, and later on he becomes even very demanding and very high-minded, high-souled.

Fielding: What does this have to do with the virtue of citizens?

S: This question is here not opened. It would be wholly improper to open it. That comes up only in the proper context. One can say even in a dialogue which is much more detailed than the Apology is, the Gorgias, it is still somehow taken for granted that every man ought to be a philosopher. And this leads, this leads to the consequence that the Gorgias is particularly "pessimistic." Present day commentators trace it to certain incidents in Plato's life or in Athens, because they said, you know, he was like a leaf in the wind. In one year he was sanguine and in the next year he was downhearted. But in the Republic you find there a perfectly clear statement that philosophy is only for some men, not for all. And then this raises a great question [of its own?], but it is at least...doesn't lead to this down-heartedness to which the Gorgias leads.

Fielding: But it's not altogether clear that the Apology gives an argument to the city which persuades it.

S: No. How could it? How could it? In a way Socrates of course seems to say, I mean in this posture which I have frequently imitated, Why did you not philosophize today? You, You, Everybody. And in a way it says that. But then Socrates fortunately comes to [a? our?] help by replacing philosophy by being concerned with virtue, which has a great advantage of being much vaguer, and can only mean, Did you do a good deed today? Or did you at least fail to commit a bad deed? Which is also sometimes of some value.

Fielding: How will this convince the city that it's made a mistake in putting Socrates to death? The purpose of the speech is salutary in some respect.

S: The speech tries to convince the Athenians that Socrates, so far from corrupting the young, rather improves. Surely does not corrupt. That's the main point. The purpose is not to make clear what philosophy is. Obviously not. Because that is not a term occurring in the law. And this is after all...it was a forensic...it was a criminal trial. Good. You want to say something?

R: Just that perhaps the proof of Plato equals Odysseus is that Odysseus is the one who raises Achilles from the dead, Socrates identified with Achilles, and reports that he says remarkably different things.

S: No but I believe I...I did not mean more than that...Odysseus is known as poly-tropos, a man of very great versatility. And this is a quality of Socrates, and Plato too. In the Minor Hippias, the question is discussed, Who is the better man, Achilles or Odysseus? And that great fool Hippias, who is the interlocutor of Socrates, says, "Of course, Achilles, because Achilles was always honest and Odysseus is such a famous liar." And then Socrates shows to him that while Odysseus...Achilles did have this lovable simplicity, he said of course many times the untruth because he didn't know. And in Greek that's the same word--to lie and to say the untruth, [pseudes ?], whereas Odysseus was able to say the untruth deliberately because of his greater knowledge. And therefore Odysseus was a wiser man, therefore a better man, than Achilles. Now this is of course somewhat jocular but no joke without its...no joke to speak of, at least, without its seriousness. And this versatility of Socrates is of course also the versatility of Plato,

who could not present it if he didn't have it. Good. Yes?

Q: 41b, Socrates talks to his acquitters about going to Hades, he mentions when he goes there he'll be able to see who is wise and who is not wise. Why doesn't he mention that he may encourage them to be virtuous? Why is only one mentioned and not the other?

S: In 41 b, you say. You say 41b? Q: He says "The most important thing would be to pass my time in examining and investigating the people as to who is wise and who is not wise."

S: Well, very simple. You should all know the answer. Is virtue not the same as wisdom? Well this is of course one of these very slick and flip answers which anyone with the slightest familiarity with Plato can give, and it's not good enough because Plato argues on a different level. And on a certain primary level, of course wisdom and virtue are some very different things. I mean we ordinarily call a man a good man if he is temperate and just. There is Platonic evidence for that. Temperate and just. Without being wise. And Plato uses sometimes the word "good" in this narrow sense. But he indeed would say a man who is only temperate and just, without being sensible, which is the more common word--phronimos, not sophos, as here. That is a very defective goodness, because he would not be able to give an account of what he is doing; he would only do it because of what he's told by his parents, by his society and this is not sufficient. Good.

Now let us turn to the Crito. Now the Crito is the natural sequel to the Apology, and therefore the fact that they appear in the manuscripts, the Crito appears in the manuscripts immediately after the Apology, is perfectly in order. The Apology as we know is a public conversation with the people of Athens. The Crito, however, is a conversation in the greatest privacy between Socrates and his oldest friend. And in addition not only is it in great...they are alone, but they are also closed off from the world because Socrates is in prison. And in addition it is still dark when it begins. So we are externally at the opposite pole of the Apology. The theme is, Should Socrates escape from prison--and that means of course from Athens--in order to save his life? More generally stated, Should he disobey the law? And Socrates answer is, One must obey the law without ifs and buts. Good.

Now we have to know a bit about Crito before--at least it is practical to do that--before we turn to the dialogue. He was mentioned twice in the Apology, as you have seen. He was one of the men who would vouch for Socrates' not corrupting the young with a view to Crito's son Critobulus. And he was one of the four men who were vouching for the fine which Socrates willing to pay. He also occurs quite a bit in the Phaedo. He was present at Socrates' death, the day of his death, and he was the one who was commissioned by Socrates to sacrifice the cock to Asclepius. Socrates owed a debt to the god and he entrusted Crito, who also was financially in a good position to do so, to bring that sacrifice. He is also an important character in the dialogue Euthydemus, which is at first glance the most comical of the Platonic dialogues. And I mention only one point: it is the only Platonic dialogue which begins with the words this an, "Who was it," in contradistinction to the famous Socratic question, "What is" which is a philosophical question. "Who was it?" is a question of curiosity. This question is raised not by

Socrates but by Crito. I prefer to, because it is simpler, to read to you two passages from Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. After having shown that Socrates had nothing to do with these super-scoffers Critias and Alcibiades, he says: "But Crito wae", let us say "a friend of Socrates, and Chaerephon," the man who went to Delphi, "and Chaerecrates," the brother of Chaerephon, "and Hermogenes, and Simias, and Cebes, and Phaedonides, and others who came together with Socrates--not in order to become public or forensic speakers, but in order after having become perfect gentlemen they would be able to use nobly their households and members of their households and relatives and friends and the city and citizens well. And of these men," these seven men here mentioned by name, "no one either when young or when old has ever done anything bad nor has he been accused of it." These seven people in the middle of which we find Hermogenes, who plays quite a role in Xenophon, but I cannot go into that. So in other words, as Burnet puts it, these are the true Socratics, which is a very funny statement when you think that Plato is absent. Plato whose rank is very clearly stated by Xenophon himself later on in the *Memorabilia*. But the main passage is later in the second book in chapter 9. I must say a word about the context. The chapters...Book II, 7-10, deal with Socrates' posture toward his friends, how he helps them. And these are very funny stories, read with complete lack of humor by the general interpreters, general run of interpreters of Xenophon. And one of them is Crito. It is interesting that in a few cases the people are not called friends, in Greek philoí, but other words--hetairoi, which means something like comrades, or even simply gnorimoi, acquaintances. Nothing of this kind is done in the Crito chapter, for a very good reason as you will see. "I know that he," Socrates, "once heard Crito say that life in Athens was difficult for a man who wished to mind his own business." You know, i.e., a nice man who doesn't wish to...not a busybody. "At this moment," Crito added, "actions are pending against me not because I have done the plaintiffs any injury, but because they think that I would sooner pay than have trouble." "Tell me, Crito," said Socrates, "Do you keep dogs to fend the wolves from your sheep?" "Certainly," replied Crito, "because it pays me better to keep them." Socrates: "Then why not keep a man who may be able and willing to fend off the attempts to injure you?" Crito: "I would gladly do so were I not afraid that he might turn on me." [Laughter] "What," Socrates said, "don't you see that it is much pleasanter to profit by humoring a man like you than by quarreling with him? I assure you there are many in this city who would take pride in your friendship." Whereupon they seek out, Crito and Socrates seek out, "Archdemus, an excellent speaker and man of affairs, but poor. For he was not one of those who made money unscrupulously, but an honest man. And he would say that it was easy to take forfeit from false accusers. So whenever Crito was corn, oil, wine, wool, or other farm produce," Crito obviously being a farmer, a gentleman farmer, "he would make a present of a portion to Archdemus, and when he ascribed he invited him, and in fact lost no similar opportunity of showing courtesy. Archdemus came to regard Crito's house as a haven of refuge and constantly paid his respects to him. He soon found out that Crito's false accusers, his sycophants, had much to answer for and many enemies." The sycophant is the Athenian equivalent to what we call a public prosecutor. There was no public prosecutor, but everyone who wished [sounded like "hobnobbing"/], everyone who wished and knew of any bad action could denounce it to the authorities, and this led to the fact that some people lived from that because it was obviously a good source of income as I don't have to labor when speaking in the city of Chicago. So this Archdemus brought one of them to trial on a charge involving damages or imprisonment. "The defendant," this sycophant, "conscious that he was guilty on many counts did all he could to get rid of Archdemus.

But Archdemus refused to let him off like a true dog until he withdrew the action against Crito and compensated him. Archdemus carried through several other enterprises of a similar kind. And now many of Crito's friends begged him to make Archdemus their protector, just as when a shepherd has a good dog, the other shepherds want to pen their flock near his in order to get benefit from his dog. Archdemus was glad to humor Crito, and so there was peace not only for Crito but for his friends as well." In other words he was a sycophant of sycophants, and therefore very useful against sycophants. "If anyone whom he had offended reproached Archdemus with flattering Crito because he found Crito useful, Archdemus would answer, 'Which then is disgraceful: to have honest men, or gentlemen, for your friends by accepting and returning their favors, and to fall out with crooks? Or to treat gentlemen as enemies by trying to injure them and to ask friends of crooks by siding with them and to prefer their intimacy?' Henceforward Archdemus was respected, or honored, by Crito's friends and was himself honored among them." So Archdemus was a friend of Crito. If this is the meaning of friend, could Socrates have been a friend of Crito? Socrates liked him; they knew each other very well. But in any serious sense of the word he was not his friend. I think that is a nice story. And, well there are other such stories...You might read these whole four chapters in Xenophon, Book II chapters 7-10. Good. Now let us begin at the beginning of the Crito.

R: Socrates: "Why have you come at this time,...Just before dawn."

S: Now you see here Socrates...this dialogue begins a Socratic question. And the first question which is answered at least is, "Is it not very early?" The beginning has a certain resemblance to a scene under the beginning of Plato's Protagoras. You know?

A: Hippocrates comes to see Protagoras and it's very early in the morning, before dawn, and he's just heard that Protagoras is at the house of...I forgot his name. S: Callias. A: Callias. And he comes and he wakes Socrates up and he wants to rush over there because he knows that...

S: In order to see Protagoras. So but he...The common thing is he arrives in the early morning. But in contradistinction to Crito he awakens Socrates and the purport is to see Protagoras. Here the situation is otherwise very different. Yes?

R: "I am surprised the watchman...I have done something for him."

S: So you see...I'm sure that this was not an illegal action; on the other hand I believe it was not an action commanded by law. [Laughter] This was the second question. Now? We come to the third question.

R: "Have you just come,...Some little time ago."

S: That is the third question let us count. Yes?

R: "Then why did you not wake me...since you hear it so easily and calmly."

S: "And gently." So this is the fourth question of Socrates, "Why did you not wake me up?" And Crito answers the question and shows a very touching concern.

He is concerned with Socrates' spending his life as pleasantly as possible. Yes. And with that peculiar pleasure which derives from oblivion of unpleasantness, in this case of his death. And he admires Socrates' ability to forget, which derives from Socrates' disposition, from his tropos. Crito we see here again is a benefactor. Just as he benefitted the guards, the prison guard, he benefits in another way, in a more important way, his old friend, Socrates. Yes.

R: "Well, Crito, it would be absurd...by their fate. That is true."

S: Let us stop here. It is foolish to be angry that one has to die when one is old. This raises a question, would he have felt differently and would he have acted differently if he had been still young or of middle age? We remember the passage toward the end of the Apology when he says it is now good for him to die. And of course by his remark about Socrates' disposition Crito draws our attention unconsciously to the great difference between Socrates' disposition and his own, which we must keep in mind if we wish to understand what happens later. Yes?

R: "But why have you come so early?...I think, so grievous as to me."

S: Now here we have the fifth question, if we count. Yes?

R: "What is this news:...tomorrow, Socrates, your life must end."

S: Now here we have the sixth question, which is answered in a manner by Socrates himself. The news? He is almost sure that the answer is that the ship has come from Delos at the arrival of which he must die. This is the last of the initial Socratic questions. And here what Crito says in his answer is a most important piece of information, which Crito possesses and which Socrates lacks, because Socrates is cut off from the world. And that knowledge derives from human messengers. I think that's obvious. They come from Sunion the sea, that the ship has come back from Crete. Now we are therefore...won't take any undue risk if we say that the Crito opens with "Socratic questions" to which Crito and not Socrates possesses the answers. Socrates couldn't know whether Crito came now or an hour ago, and so on. And the reason is that Socrates is cut off from the world, asleep in prison. This we must understand in order to understand the sequel.

R: "Well, Crito, good luck be with us!...not think it will come to-day."

S: Well now, you see, that is one point. Although Socrates is closed off from the world and has no information, he is...doesn't trust the human messengers. Why?

R: "What is your reason...let me sleep just at the right time."

S: Now let us stop here. So Socrates doesn't believe in what the human messengers say and the inference from it, but he believes in the dream. And in the light of the dream Crito's concern with Socrates' sleep proves to be a very good action. Because he would have disturbed that dream.

R: "What was the dream?"

S: Now it is Crito's turn to ask a question. And with this little thing the

leadership in the dialogue passes from Crito to Socrates as we will see in the sequel. Yes.

R: "What was the dream?...thou wouldst come to fertile Phthia."

S: Let us stop there. Now the verse is from the ninth book of the Iliad, where Achilles speaks to Odysseus. And there is only a minor change because since Achilles is the speaker, he says "I will come...I would come at the third day to Phthia." And since in Socrates' dream it is said by a woman it must of course be changed into "Thou wilt come." Otherwise it is literally correct. Socrates at any rate seems to be in the role of Achilles. And this is not surprising, because we have seen his Achillean character in the Apology, 28c-d. But this difficulty: Socrates is old and Achilles was young. Achilles had the choice between dying young and gaining imperishable fame on the one hand, and returning to Phthia and a long life on the other. That is later on in the ninth book of the Iliad. What are the choices before Socrates? Socrates seems to have the choice between dying now and a good reputation on the one hand, and escaping from prison and living a little longer on the other. Now what choice is recommended by the dream? That would be the question. To come home. That would mean...can be interpreted to come to the other world, and that is [escaping?] the obvious meaning. But there is a certain ambiguity here, because where is Phthia? R: In Thessaly? S: In Thessaly. [Laughter] And Thessaly is the place which Crito has in mind where Socrates should escape. Whether one could come in two days from Athens to Thessaly is another question. There are other difficulties, but it's very funny. But who is that decent woman dressed...beautiful, and good to look at, and having [laughter interferes here, but Mr. Strauss appears to be giving some Greek words from the text], a good form and shape, and having white dresses. Who is she? Now since the story is taken primarily from Achilles one could think for a moment of Thetis his mother, who appears to Achilles in the Iliad. But the woman--Thetis is a goddess and he speaks here of a woman. It's hard to say. And any guess is possible. Any guess is possible which is not demonstrably wrong. Say if you would say this woman was the wife of President Johnson, that would be patently false, because he couldn't have known her. [Laughter] But so I suggest one as a possibility among I'm sure a million. It could be one of the Clouds, in the company of which Socrates was presented in Aristophanes' Clouds. But. Good. Now let us read only a very few lines now.

R: "A strange dream, Socrates....But, my dear Socrates,..."

S: Now let us stop here one moment, and that's the end [what we will do?]. The word which he translates by "dear" is a *daimonion* Socrates, which is used colloquially in the sense, "You strange fellow," but which has here an ambiguity unknown to Crito. Namely, "You demonic Socrates." "You divine," in a way, "the story of Thessaly, that you should arrive in Thessaly in a few days." We'll leave it at that and next time we will go on.

There was someone...A nameless student wrote to me, "Please clarify the relationship between the philosopher and the city as it is presented in the Apology. I would appreciate a more thematic treatment of this question in class." Good. Despite the namelessness of the writer I'm willing to do my best. I think I have complied with this request to the extent to which it was feasible on the basis of the text we have read, hitherto discussed. But a few points will bear repeating. Now what you will find in the Republic explicitly in such a way that the meanest capacity will become aware of it at the first reading, is this: that the polis has the power--as distinguished from the right--to forbid philosophizing. And Socrates says, as you know, if the city should forbid it I would not obey her. The serious question and the philosophic question is this: Is this possibility that the city has the power to forbid philosophizing essential to the city, or only an accident due to a misconception of the city? I would say Yes, and this is the reason why this student wrote this paper, I believe. And I would state it in the form of a syllogism, as follows: Philosophy is the attempt to replace opinions about everything, about the greatest things, by knowledge of them. But the city rests, stands and falls by, opinions about the greatest things. Therefore philosophy, by trying to replace the opinions by knowledge, questions the foundations of society, and to that extent it is a danger to society, or to use a blunt word, is subversive. Now let us take an example from our country or age. The beginning of the Declaration of Independence, where certain things are presented there as evident truths. The majority of people today, at least of academic people today, say these are not evident truths. And that would mean in older language they are opinions. Now if the academic teacher does his duty and makes clear that these are opinions and not knowledge, he to that extent weakens the power of these opinions, subverts them. Now fortunately people are not always so curious or so serious about these matters as they should, and therefore nothing happens. That is to say nothing of the concept of academic freedom or other freedoms into which I do not have to go here, although it is very relevant. The ordinary, the prevailing view today, as you all know, is this: Such things as stated in the beginning of the Declaration of Independence, or in any other place of this kind, are value judgments. And being value judgments they cannot possibly be true or untrue, correct or wrong. And therefore you can...if you don't like them particularly you can replace them in your own mind by other, opposite opinions, and you cannot act on that because the law which you have to obey. But that by questioning the ultimate rationale of the laws you are in an awkward position morally, that is not... apparently doesn't create any heart-rending difficulties for most of our contemporaries. By strassing the value character of these things, one in a way subverts them, as lies in one's power. And this creates a problem. So in other words, to come to a conclusion of this point, the problem with which Socrates was concerned, or Plato, is still with us--mitigated, or obfuscated, by the fact that we live in a liberal society, that is to say in a society which guarantees as a matter of principle freedom of inquiry, whereas there was no such guaranty in former times. And this is of course a great benefit for every inquirer, but we must also consider, must be precisely, if we want to be true social scientists, i.e., to see not only what is attractive in our values but also what is repulsive in them, therefore we must not concede the other side. And this is my practical criticism of the now reigning school. They stem from Max Weber, as you know, this value-free social science. But what Max Weber had in mind was this, that the academic teacher should make clear to himself what can be said against his preferences and take it seriously. Whereas the mass of the present-day social scientists are

concerned only what speaks against value judgments which they abhor anyway, which does not require any intelligence and any self control at all, as you know. You just go into the classroom or into, say, a study without undergoing any change, any conversion, to ordinary beliefs, political beliefs, adherence to ordinary beliefs, to a critical posture toward your own beliefs. This, as I say, is very easy and can be done by everyone without any effort whatsoever.

Yes. Now let me see, I must first find my notes. One second; I will be with you in a second. Yes.

Q: You said that the power to forbid philosophizing is essential to the city.

S: Oh, I didn't say that. I started from...I was much more careful. I said the city can do it. Now, if you say from the actuality, the conclusion from actuality, to potentiality or possibility, is a good conclusion, which I believe it is, and then you can say from this point of view it is an essential possibility of the city.

Q: But you were just talking about the power. Does that make it just? I'm sure that it doesn't necessarily...

S: I said there's a power as distinguished from the right. Q: Does that mean it's not just? S: That requires an inquiry. From the...In liberal societies we take for granted that there should be no opinions which are as such forbidden. Whether this is feasible under all circumstances is a very long question. It depends also on the degree of stability of the country concerned. In other words, opinions which may be bearable, as bearable for society, as fleas are for dogs in peaceful societies, may be as unbearable as savage animals in less peaceful situations. You know? For example, let us take...Well, you know the practice of the Communists; I don't have to labor that point. They regard definitely certain opinions as forbidden opinions. And if someone would write a criticism of Marxism in Soviet Russia or any other of these countries, he would soon cease to be a professor. And how they would justify it...But perhaps they would say no student comes anymore to his classes because the students will be prevented by Comsomol members from attending his class. Well similar things apply in the Nazi regime, as you know, where if someone would have written a book attacking their racial science he wouldn't find a publisher. And if he would have said it in classes there would have been some representatives, or more than one of the Nazi party who would have stopped him. Now these things of course happen in liberal countries; you know that. But in another way there is of course a kind of non-legal and very mild censorship. You have may have read the expression the establishment, in the newspaper. The establishment being that man or body of men who protects the favored opinions of that society and punishes in a non-legal--I don't say illegal--manner by all kinds of devices those who don't happen to agree with the establishment. I mean there is not...without any question there are various ways in which it can be done. You know? For example you can say if a man writes an essay based on the ruling prejudices, and a very poor essay, and another man writes an equally poor essay based on prejudices other than the ruling ones, the first has a much greater chance to be published than the other. I have heard that a certain university, where a student wrote a doctor's thesis on the subject, freedom and virtue, that he was severely examined regarding virtue but no one quarrelled with him

on his speaking of freedom. And obviously the goose and gander would easily apply. Virtue is a word which cannot be used without great caution and long examination. The same would be true of freedom, I would say. This exists in all societies, and it would be very inhuman and uncharitable to complain about that. That is so. But it shows indeed, that was the point which I'm trying to make, that the problem of Socrates is not disposed of merely...completely disposed of merely by the emergence of liberal societies. It lives on. Yes?

Q: But still...I'm aware that you can't answer the question, isn't just? simply just by telling me. But I would like you to help me if you could, to suggest some of the relevant things to consider in order to further an inquiry into what the cities do, and what they still seem to do, is just.

S: Of course one must do that. Q: But how? Would you suggest the questions ... S: Well there are all kinds of questions. In one way the most...wiciest thing is to begin with specific questions. Such as, should there civil boards watching the activity of the police? That's a concrete question. That has something to do with that question. And also the question, what about obscenity? You know the famous Berkeley issue. Does the freedom of speech include the freedom of obscene speech? Of which no one ever thought in former times. But now with the gradual enlargement of the liberal principles there is no reason. I suggested many years ago that the men who are supposed to make the final decision on matters of this kind, namely the Supreme Court, should have a seminar among themselves, studying the Shakespearean plays, and see to what extent obscenity occurring there differs from obscenity used in Playboy, if that is...makes...Is it a magazine? I have never read it. [Laughter] All right, never mind. [Laughter]

R: Eros is the magazine. [Laughter] As I read in the papers. [Laughter]

S: I'm more innocent than you. Good. In other words, for example also from the quantitative point of view that would play a certain role, would it not? Say in a thousand words there is only one obscene word does make a difference than if every tenth word is obscene. But there are more subtle things than that.

Q: Another question, I suppose, is, you pointed out that Socrates was convicted by Athens under a law saying...about impiety. Now the question of the justice of that law I suppose has to be raised. S: Sure. Q: And I was wondering, you know, how the Apology...

S: In the Apology he takes this law for granted, of course. I mean that is not the best place to question a law when you are accused of the transgression of it. But Plato takes it up, as I said, in the Laws, where he raises the question, What are those opinions which ought to be accepted by every citizen in a well ordered society? And there he brings in the gods who, in his opinion, are demonstrably beings, what I call the comic gods and this [we must accept?], but making it quite clear what is usually not considered, that if these people who transgress this fundamental law regarding the gods are otherwise honest men they will not be capitally punished; they will only be put into jail and there have the company of wiser men who will try to show them that they were wrong, which is a rather humane form of punishment. Good. And of course the question of First Amendment regarding freedom of religion, does it mean freedom from religion? and so

forth. Mr. London.

London: I have a short question about the gods of the city. When there is a change of regime, when an oligarchy becomes a desocracy for example, the gods don't change. S: No. London: And while there are Athenian gods there are no democratic gods or oligarchic gods.

S: But there are certain differences there, but in general you are right. For example the mutilation of the Hermae in 415, you know, the beginning of the Sicilian expedition? The Hermae were especially connected--Hermes was

--with the Athenian democracy. There were preferences for this or that god or for this or that cult, which had a political...But generally speaking you are right.

London: Well I guess that in a way does answer it. I mean the thought occurred to me that in a certain respect that the difference of regimes was neutral with respect to...I mean that although belief in some god was required, that the gods themselves had no preference.

S: Yes. This is true. This is in a general way true and that is of course a very striking--especially in Aristotle's Politics, when he speaks of the things which every city as city requires. And then he begins...I forgot now. He starts from bottom--you have to have a Greek culture, and you have to have arts, and so on, up to the government. And then he says in this list of n points, I believe nine, "fifth and first" what we would call religion, what he calls concern with the divine things. Fifth ... First, of course, according to its intrinsic rank. But fifth from the point of view of the polis, of the needs of the polis. This is a great question. Generally speaking what you say about the neutrality of regimes in regard to the gods of the city is correct. But there is one kind of regime which is essentially connected with the gods, and that is what...to use a term not occurring in Plato or Aristotle but coined much later, theocracy. The term was coined, as far as I know, by Philo the Jew in trying to spell out the character of the Jewish Biblical regime. But there is, however, a Greek equivalent, and that is the rule of priests. The rule of priests has obviously a closer relation to "religion"--I put it in quotes because there is no Greek word for religion--than the difference between oligarchy, democracy, and monarchy. But here the position of the classical philosophers is I think quite clear. They were against rule of priests. The simple proof would be, most obvious proof would be, what Plato says at the beginning of the Timaeus when he described, or his character described, the Egyptian regime, which is described as a rule of priests. And in obvious confrontation with the rule of philosophers in the Republic. Now Mr. Bruell?

Bruell: At the beginning of this course you said that we shouldn't lightly speak of Socrates' death as tragic. And then you said that... S: We should not speak of...Bruell: We should not lightly speak of Socrates' death as tragic. S: Yes, Bruell: And then you spoke of...you mentioned that Hegel did consider his death to be tragic and the reason, or at least part of the reason, was that two equally high things . Well from the statement which you made at the beginning of this class I don't understand the difference between the presentation of Plato in the Apology and Hegel's presentation.

S: That is a good question but I believe the answer is very simple. The conflict can lead to tragedy; that I will gladly grant. But did it lead to a tragedy in the case of Socrates?

Eruell: No, but does that settle the question as to whether it's essentially tragic? I thought that was the...

S: Yes, I grant you that. But the question concerns the fate of Socrates. And here we have to consider the fact, which comes out very clearly at the end of the Apology, that Socrates died when he was 70, i.e., at the time when death was for him less--much less--of an evil than when he would have been younger. To that extent I still maintain it. And Socrates' emphasis throughout the latter part of the Apology that this is not an evil. I mean a tragedy presupposes that some evil happens to someone. Socrates denies that's... Eruell: But what about... What would you say in reference... S: The destruction of philosophy would be an evil. The destruction of the polis as polis would be an evil, obviously. But neither philosophy nor the polis was destroyed in that time. There were some... Of course not an easy situation. There is an allusion... The clearest statement is a remark made by Isocrates, the teacher of rhetoric, at the beginning of his writing called Busiris -- B-u-s-i-r-i-s--a tyrannical Egyptian king, whom he praises there. It's a very funny piece. And there he speaks of the fact that philosophy was laid low in 399. And I forgot now the exact wording but it was apparently a dangerous situation, and Plato's absence from Socrates' death-bed, so to speak, may very well have to be connected with the fact that he had left Athens at that time. He left it surely shortly afterward. Now Xenophon had been exiled a few years before. But this may have had purely political reasons, Xenophon being a knight belonging to the knightly class, aristocratic class. Good.

Yes. Now I must draw a line somewhere. Because we should really read something in the Crito. Now we began last time the dialogue Crito and we have seen that this dialogue is in an unusual way a privetissimo, a most private conversation between Socrates and his old friend Crito. And it begins with Socratic questions of a sort. And these questions are questions to which Crito possesses the complete answer. And the ordinary Socratic questions are, as you know, questions to which the questioned man does not have an answer. But when hearing Crito's answer to his last question, Socrates doubts Crito's answer. Crito's answer was an inference from a message brought by human messengers. And Socrates doubts that answer on the basis of a dream which he had had. We can say on the basis of a knowledge of more than human origin. Critias [Crito?] thinks that Socrates will have to die tomorrow, the day after they meet, but Socrates is sure that he will have to die only the day after tomorrow. And Socrates believes that on the basis of the dream. The dream makes use of a word from the Iliad in which Achilles is the speaker addressing Odysseus. In Socrates' dream a fair woman is the speaker, addressing Socrates. So you see there is another parallelism between Socrates and Odysseus, a point which I have made more than once. The dream is--as a dream should be--ambiguous. It may mean that on the day after tomorrow Socrates will be dead, i.e., in Hades, after having won great fame through his law-abidingness. Or that he will be in Thessaly, or on his way to Thessaly, having escaped death by flight and at the same time jeopardized his fame as a law-abiding man. That is the choice before Achilles, the [phrase?] in terms of the choice before Socrates. So this was the point to which we came, and then we go on. Does it have to do with what I said now?

Q: With what you said now. Why does one necessarily win fame by abiding by the law? S: Pardon? Why is it necessarily true that one acquires fame by abiding by the law? S: Acquires fame by... A: Abiding by the law. S: Are you not concerned with your good reputation? And do you not endanger it by having some prior convictions? Yes?

Q: The thing that came to mind...you mentioned this on the first day of class. If you were in Nazi Germany...

S: I see. Yes, yes. That is indeed true. In other words laws may be so bad and unjust that it is an honor to transgress them. That's quite true. Keep this question in mind because that is the chief subject of the Crito. Good. Now let us continue on, 44b 3. We read that already...the beginning we read already last time. "The dream seems to be clear to me, Crito," Socrates says. Yes?

R: "No, a clear one, at any rate, ...had been willing to spend money,..."

S: But this..."Besides," this is important; this is a new argument. "And furthermore I will seem to many..."

R: "...but that I would not take the trouble....could be more disgraceful..."

S: No, "that I could have saved you if I had wished to spend money..."

R: "...if I had been willing to spend money...of more importance than one's friends?"

S: Or rather "seeming to," "what reputation would be more disgraceful than seeming to regard money as higher than friends?" Yes?

R: "For most people...but you refused."

S: Now let us stop here. Now the word for "friends" which occurs when he says "I will be deprived of such a friend" is in Greek the word epitēdeios, not the ordinary, common word, philos. And this has in a way a lower meaning. I have a note here somewhere. This word epitēdeios occurs here with unusual frequency. I have at least five references. Epitēdeios means made for a purpose, suitable, convenient, useful, serviceable, necessary, friendly. In other words the utilitarian aspect of friendship is more visible here than the other one, the more noble one. Now Crito bases on Socrates to escape for Crito's sake. The main point is Crito's reputation is harmed if Socrates does not escape. And that is the beginning. So, "Do it for my sake." This has to do...What I said about the meaning of the word for friend used here, the utilitarian consideration, is of course quite powerful in this very nice old man, Crito. He is a very nice man, but you know niceness has many strata, and if you look through the niceness of a man with a kind of X-rays, it is not quite so nice as if you look at it with unaided eyes; you must know that. That happens quite frequently and we could not live if we always used X-ray toward ourselves and others. Good. Yes?

R: "But my dear Crito, why...For the most reasonable men,..."

S: More literally, "Why do we care so much about the opinion of the many?"

greatest evils. But there are also lesser evils which a sensible man would try to avoid. One surely has to fear the sycophants, the denouncers. They, at any rate, can do harm to one. Especially regarding one's property, if one has property. And Crito has very much of it. Whereas Crito had asked Socrates to consider Crito's reputation, he does not ask him to consider Crito's property. To that extent Crito is a noble character. It is Crito's duty to sacrifice for his friend his fortune, but not his reputation. On the contrary. Now this is a very...a point which deserves considering. If you replace the word reputation for one moment by sacred honor, giving the formula of the Declaration of Independence. You remember--do you know it by heart? A: Our lives, our fortune, and our sacred honor. S: No, the verb, the verb which they use. A: We pledge. S: They pledge their fortunes, meaning they sacrifice their fortunes. But they pledge their sacred honor to uphold their sacred honor, not to forsake it. This same difference is meant here, yes?

Q: Is it possible to construe Crito's emphasis on the need for saving Socrates as a realization on Crito's part of Socrates' value as a philosopher, as an inquirer?

S: Well that is...I mean if I may take a liberty and make a mere assertion without proof, I would say no. No. I think Crito was a very nice man, as nice people go. He liked Socrates, an old friend, and he relied on Socrates' advice in practical matters. Xenophon's beautiful chapter, which I read to you, is a good example. You know when Socrates...when Crito was in trouble from the sycophants, and Socrates gave him the advice to have recourse to a counter-sycophant who would...just as a dog keeps away the wolves, you remember that? And Xenophon may have exaggerated a bit, but Crito was not a man greatly concerned with inquiry, I believe. But he liked Socrates, and his whole...I think his whole self esteem was linked up with Socrates, you know. He had a certain dignity in Athens as a friend of Socrates and now this imposes a certain duty upon it. For example, quite simply, to sacrifice all his fortune, which was considerable, but not to sacrifice his honor, on the contrary. Good. Yes?

R: "I am considering this, Crito, and many other things."

S: Yes. "I consider both this and many other things." meaning he doesn't enlarge on that. And we have to use our own poor imaginations to say of what other things he could also consider. And I believe one could say that Socrates may also have some concern with Crito's not incurring such great monetary losses. This is at any rate the way in which Crito understands Socrates, as we see from the sequel. Yes?

R: "Well, do not fear this!...which is enough, I fancy..."

S: Let us stop here. So in other words "If you worry about so many things, and maybe among them say having to spend so much money, don't worry, because it won't cost so much. You see how inexpensive the sycophants are." Which is almost an allusion to the story in Xenophon. "You yourself gave me that excellent advice." Yes. Now?

R: "...and moreover, if because you care...no one in Thessaly shall annoy you."

S: Thessaly is already known to us from the dream because of Phthia which was mentioned there. Apparently this is a new argument here, when he says in b7 that...Oh, in b2, epaita. But as the essay transition shows, Crito still thinks of money. Socrates must after all live with his family in Thessaly. And so the people who try to get him out not only have to pay the guard and these other people, but they also have to give money to Socrates on his way to and in Thessaly. So this is still a question here. Yes. Now? Read only the beginning of the following passage.

R: "And besides, Socrates, it seems to me the thing you are undertaking..."

S: No, no. "Furthermore." So it is a new argument. "It does not seem to me even to be just," and so on and so on. So here Crito's third and last argument begins. And the three arguments are: first, Crito's reputation; b) Crito's money; and three, justice, or in other words, Socrates' duty. It was...There was no question of Socrates in the first two arguments--of Socrates' reputation and of Socrates' money, the latter because of its non-existence. But here now Socrates becomes... [so what is?] Socrates' duty. And now let us see what that duty is.

R: "...--betraying yourself..." S: No, you begin at the beginning of this passage. R: "Besides Socrates, it does not seem...who wished to destroy you."

S: So in other words this is Socrates' duty toward himself, we can say. His self preservation. And there is a simple, practical criterion of what you should not do to yourself, namely, you should not do to yourself what your enemies wish to do to you [laughs]. It's not bad as a practical rule. Although it might be...it's not universally true because your enemies might be fools, and do to your things in order to harm you which are to your benefit. So we have always to use our judgment. But still as a crude rule of thumb it is not so bad. Yes.

R: "And moreover,..." S: Another argument. Yes? R: "...I think you are abandoning your children, too,..." S: All right, "your sons." Yes? R: "...for when you might bring them up...to be choosing the laziest way;..."

S: Yes, so now Socrates' duty toward his sons, as distinguished from himself. And what Crito suggests is, "You are an irresponsible hedonist, or egoist; instead of taking the trouble with your children you prefer the easy way out." This is the whole argument regarding Socrates' duty, as we will see immediately. What does he omit? [Noise interference blocked out the next one or two sentences.] Crito doesn't say anything of Socrates' duty toward the polis, which is of course very beautifully done by Plato. So this is then the big engine which Plato brings in...makes Plato bring in in his reply. Yes?

R: He doesn't speak of Socrates' duty to continue philosophizing.

S: You expect much too much. As far as I know the word "philosophy" never occurs in the Crito.

R: But he could at least have said that he would be good for Thessaly.

S: But [laughs] he was a practical man, a pedestrian fellow. and "me first,"

With obvious limitations. He was also certainly concerned with the epitedeioi, with those who did him a good turn and are likely to do him some other good turns. We of course must keep this argument in mind and all the various steps, in order to see how Socrates is going to reply to them. He doesn't have to reply to the money matter because Crito himself has said it won't cost Crito a cent; it will all be done by the friends from Thebes, and that he doesn't have to take up. The other things he might have to take up. Now let us go on in h5d 6-8.

R: "...and you ought to choose as a good...that you cared for virtue."

S: That should be translated a bit more [strongly?], "claiming," as it were, "You of all people who claimed throughout your life to be concerned with virtue, you should surely behave like a virtuous man, namely..." One can say this is a general remark on Socrates' duty, whereas the preceding ones were specific. Socrates at any rate of all people must choose what a good and manly man would choose. Crito doesn't speak of good and sensible, but of good and manly, which is also characteristic. Yes?

R: "So I am ashamed..." S: For the same reason for which he spoke as the argument taken from the enemies as a good argument. Because concern with enemies belongs the sphere of courage and manliness. Yes?

R: "So I am ashamed both for you...will think that this whole affair..."

S: "Think" is always the word for opinion, opine. All right. Good.

R: "...of the opinion that this whole affair of yours...the trial itself was carried on,..."

S: [Laughs] Namely that what Socrates did in defending himself. Yes?

R: "...and finally they will opine ...both to you and to us."

S: Let us stop here. You see Crito returns now via Socrates' duty to the subject with which he began, but changing it somewhat. The subject is "our reputation," that is to say of course Socrates' reputation, but also Crito's reputation. For the question of money has been disposed of as we have seen. In a 3, at the end of what Mr. Reinken read. "See that it be not together with the evil also ugly, base for us. The evil is the death, the loss of a friend, and other things of this kind. The disgraceful [death?] refers to the reputation. So he returns...he returned then to this subject. He began with Crito's reputation, Crito's money, Socrates' duty, Socrates' over-all duty to act like a virtuous and brave man, and then finally Socrates' and Crito's reputation, and therefore in particular also again Crito's reputation. A nice circle. So here there is a point which Burnet makes which I thought we should consider, to e 3 and e 4. The word which he doesn't bring out...he uses the word "absurdity" elsewhere. Do you know? A: "The crowning absurdity." S: The word is a derivative from the word for laughter, and which is brought out by Burnet by saying, "We should have to suppose that Crito regarded the trial of Socrates as a comedy," one of the wisest remarks which Burnet, in my opinion, ever makes. . how? and when he speaks of this contest, this doubtless refers to the refusal of Socrates to defend himself seriously and to his counter-proposal," namely, you know, prytaneia, "which

was a mere defiance of the court." Well but if you think a bit straight, if Socrates here refuses to defend himself seriously, then he defended himself un-seriously, and which is very hard to distinguish from comedy. Good. Yes. Now let us go on where we left off.

R: "Just consider, or rather it is this...and don't refuse."

S: Yes. Now here is a point which Burnet makes. Speaking of the coming night, the last opportunity. "Crito still thinks in spite of the dream that the ship will arrive today," i.e., that Socrates has another night at his disposal. Now what do you say of that, in spite of the dream? Is this not funny? He regards it as possible that this nice gentleman farmer is in any way impressed by Socrates' dream. You see, I mean this...That's the reason why I read you this point. So this is then the whole speech of Crito. And the sequel is Socrates' reply, and the reply by which Socrates tries to prove to Crito that Socrates must stay in Athens and die. And of course this goes without saying, or rather I should say it should go without saying, he proves this in a way intelligible to Crito. What would he say if this were an argument which would be intelligible to say Kant if he is talking to poor Crito? Now what is the reason why we must always watch what might we get about the character of Crito, you know? So that we can see toward whom Socrates is speaking and adapting his argument. And if I may repeat a thing which I have said so many times / goes to blackboard / that some of you will regard it as nauseating. In all Platonic dialogues, in all, surely in this, Socrates speaks to someone here. To say talking down is in one sense correct, but not in that nasty sense in which the expression "talking down" is meant. Because Socrates... there is surely no...Crito doesn't have the impression, or any other interlocutor of Socrates, that he is talking down to him. Whereas when you say of someone he is talking down to someone else you mean the other, the addressee notices it, and that is indeed a sign of lack of humanity or urbanity. Socrates...but in fact he addresses him...he adapts himself to the capacity of the interlocutor. And therefore if we want to know what Socrates thinks of this argument or of how he would state it for himself or someone to whom he would not to have talked down, we have to consider the peculiarity of that X. For example in the case, say, of Critobulus, Crito's son. He might very well talk this way. It depends. And the task would be to replace these lines with this one. And that means that we must try, within the limits of our possibility, to become better men. Otherwise we will not be able to make this transformation. So much is it true that according to Socrates and Plato virtue is knowledge. It is a long story whether that is simply true, but there is / a lot of / truth in that, and that is why. Good. And we have to try to do that within the limits of our power. Yes. Now let us go on.

R: "My dear Crito, your eagerness is worth...the more hard to bear."

S: The word "eagerness," or "zeal," in Greek prothymia, is a compound part of which is the word thymos, a word well known especially from the Republic and there ordinarily translated as spiritedness. Spiritedness must be controlled by reason. That is what Socrates says here in a way. "Your eagerness is nice if it is correct. If it is put to a wrong use or to a wrong end it would be bad." Yes?

R: "So we must examine the question...which on consideration seems to me best."

S: That is not well enough translated. "Not only now but always I am such a man as to obey," or "to follow," "to nothing other of my things except to the logos," "to the reasoning," "which on reasoning appears to me to be best." Now first we see Socrates invites Crito to a common deliberation. "We must." Plural. But Socrates follows his own judgment, which does not necessarily agree with that of Crito. Socrates may have to obey something other than his logos. Does this make sense, that he may have to obey something other than his logos? A: The law. S: Pardon? A: The laws. S: Yes, perhaps. But also? A: His daimonion. S: Daimonion. A law is as a rule another man's law. / This in response to someone who answered something like "Another man's law." / But there is another passage. If you will look that up in the Apology, 20e 5-6. "I shall not tell you my logos, but I will lead it up...trace it to a speaker who is trustworthy in your eyes." In other words, not Socrates' logos, but someone else's logos; in that case it was the logos of Chaerephon or of Apollo; that's hard to say. So Socrates does not always follow his logos. But he follows of the things belonging to him the best logos which appears to him for the time being, rather than anything else. Yes?

R: "And I cannot, now that this...discard the arguments I used..."

S: "Argumente" is always logoi. Is "Speeches." S: Yes. R: "...discard the speeches...and confiscations of property."

S: Let us stop here. You see, incidentally, that death is here in the center, and here that's a rather obvious case why it is in the center because according to a very widespread opinion death is a greater evil than imprisonment and confiscation of property. Now no chance, no work of chance of any kind, can make the logoi, the reasonings, doubtful. But perhaps other logoi, better logoi; this could happen. Could these better logoi not be occasioned, however, by a stroke of chance, which was not considered before? Take a very simple example. You have a good logos, a good rule, let me say, regarding warfare. And then by a piece of chance something else occurs and you see that this logos is not so good. Then you will of course be induced by that piece of chance to replace a former logos by another one. The acts of the multitude are acts of chance; that was said more than once. But must the logos not also consider them, these acts of chance, the general character of the acts of the multitude? That is the question. Now here is an argument of Burnet. The expression which he uses here in L/c 5, erinepousa, Burnet says, "Setting upon us, letting loose upon us. In this sense the / verb / is generally used of the gods, and is almost technical of divine visitations. The effect of the word is therefore to suggest that the power of the many, / here gives a Greek phrase /, is something mysterious and of supernatural power." That is a point to which I drew your attention before, and therefore it is a question whether one can simply dismiss it as at first glance it would seem to be. I refer to what I said on L/c 4-5. Now?

R: "Now how could we examine the matter...what you say about opinions..."

S: No wait. "What you say about opinions." "That logos," "that rule," we can say, "which you state regarding opinions." But did Crito state any logos regarding opinions? No. But Socrates did. In L/c 6-9, where Socrates contrasted the opinion of the many with what the most respectable people might think. But Crito did not protest against that distinction; to that extent one can say po-

lately it was Crito's logos, whereas in fact it is Socrates'. And the word which he uses...Yes, now go on.

R: "...and asking whether we were right...highly esteemed and others not."

S: Now let us stop here. Now there is a repeated statement regarding opinion, which opinion should be respected and which should be not. And here...Where is this point? "The opinions which human beings opine." This is a new element stated in the repetition of the thing. The question concerns the opinions of human beings. And human being may very well be understood in all Platonic

in contradistinction to andres, to hombres, to men of stature, and off. Now there may be some opinions of the multitude which have...deserve respect. The word which he uses frequently, more frequently in the original than in the translation, "every time," contains an important pointer. Meaning that one must...You have reached a result; that is now your opinion. But you must always reconsider it. Of course you can't do it all the time, but on every reasonable occasion, because you might have made a mistake. Therefore Socrates says somewhere in Xenophon, there is nothing like having another look at the matter. One must always be willing to have such an other look. Yes?

R: "By the gods, Crito, do you not think...Is not this true? It is."

S: That is still a third time repeated, seemingly the same distinction. But by thinking on that we have arrived at the question, Which opinions of the multitude deserve respect? And now...If you see at the beginning of what Mr. Reinken read now, the sermon, the oath, "By the gods," and the line thereafter, "the human things" opposed. Perhaps the opinions of the multitude regarding the gods deserve some respect. But Socrates makes now a new distinction. First, not all opinions deserve respect. Good. Second, not the opinions of all men, which is a very different consideration. But is it not sufficient to consider the opinions by themselves, regardless of who the men are who hold them? Why must one consider the many who hold them? Now in all cases in which we do not have judgment on the subject matter, we have to trust experts. Say, medicine, or whatever it may be. Hence we must first find out who is an expert. And that means for all practical purposes, who is regarded as an expert by the experts. That's a difficult circular procedure. I happen to know from study by a classical scholar that the Greeks had a way out for that, at least as far as physicians were concerned. Namely, they...there were no examinations. You know, today we can see if you have your M.D. and that makes it plausible that you are an expert. But there were no M.D.'s in Greece, and they did the following thing: The doctor had to establish his expertise at the sickbed. And he did it by asking a prognosis of what symptoms will happen. Say, he's going to have a higher temperature this afternoon, or the urine will be of that and that complexion. And if his prognosis, his prediction, proved to be right, then the non-experts could see that he was an expert. But this only in passing. Now Socrates may be presumed to be influenced in his judgment by his imminent death; that he says here. But this cannot apply to Crito; after all he doesn't have to die tomorrow or today. Crito...In other words Socrates implies that Crito is not as disturbed as he believes. There is another point in Burnet which I would like to read to you. "Crito believed that the ship will arrive today and Socrates will have to die tomorrow. It is true that Socrates thought otherwise, but it would not have been worthwhile to contradict Crito on the point once more." So, you know, what kind of pedantism he imputes to Socrates. The true explanation

is that Crito believes that Socrates will have to die tomorrow. His state of disturbance is a consequence of this belief. So there is no reason for making this remark. Yes. Now go on where we left off.

R: "Then we ought to esteem the good opinions...those of the foolish? Of course."

S: Let us stop here. Now the good ones...All right, let us say this. The most interesting point is here to make a distinction between true and untrue opinions, but between good or useful ones and bad and harmful ones. And then above all the distinction we made before-- two kinds of opinions and two kinds of men-- is now dropped. The good opinions are those of the sensible man. And of course we have to take seriously the opinions of sensible man. And this means the opinions of the multitude do not deserve any respect, contrary to what we might have thought very common sensically before. But Socrates now becomes much more radical while he proceeds and thus helps us in understanding better the radical problem. Yes?

R: "Come then, what used we to say...and not of the many. Obviously."

S: So Socrates adds now praise and blame to opinion. Because what affects us is not so much opinion as praise and blame. And what we fear are the blames. And the emphasis here is on the blames, as you see here in b2 where it is in the center. The sensible men, to whose opinion we should listen, are now replaced by the single sensible man. And that is of some importance. Socrates comes to an utter disparagement of any man. Even if there are only three or four there is likely to be one and only one man whose opinion we should follow. Yes?

R: "And he must act and exercise...rather than as all the others think."

S: "All the others."

R: "That is true."

S: So the man, the hombre, seriously concerned with gymnastics, must obey the opinion of the physician and the trainer. Also regarding food and drink, not only regarding the other things. And this is quite interesting. It shows that there is a certain expansion, as it were, of the sphere of physical training into that of moral training. Because we must not eat too much, not drink too much, nor too little, which is at least a borderline case between dietetics and morality. Yes?

R: "Well then; if he disobeys the one man...for that is what it ruins."

S: So now Socrates raises now almost invisibly the most fundamental question which has to be raised in this particular context. Why must one listen to all to praise and blame of the one expert, as distinguished from the many? And then he gives an answer. For the sake of the well being of one's body. In other words previously he had assumed the man is concerned with gymnastic training, and then [being] concerned with it we would of course listen to the expert regarding gymnastic training. But now Socrates gives a reason why one should engage at all... why every man should engage in gymnastic training. Namely, if one is concerned with the well being of one's body. In this way Socrates prepares, invisibly for the time being, the discussion of obedience to the laws. Are the law-givers, the men who made the laws, expert regarding the well being of the soul? This will

never be said here, because it would destroy the whole argument. But it is a very important Socratic and Platonic question which we must keep in mind. And then if the law givers are fumblebers regarding the well being of the soul rather than experts, then it becomes indeed a question why should one obey the laws at all? There are good enough common sensical, practical reasons--you don't want to go to jail, and so on--but this of course does not mean inner adherence to the laws which is meant by loyalty. Yes. Now go on.

R: "Right. Than in other matters,...anyone who knows about them,..."

S: "If there is any expert."

R: "Expert." "...whom we ought to revere and fear more than all the others?"

S: Let us stop here. Now Socrates applies what he found out regarding the things contributing to health or illness. He applies that now to the just, noble, and good things, what we call the moral things. In that sphere, too, one must follow the single expert rather than the opinion of the many. From the point of view of a younger follower of Socrates would say he follows rather Socrates than to what the whole city says. But Socrates makes here a grave qualification--If there is such an expert. But then we have to raise the question, What ought we to do if there is no such expert regarding these matters? If the best thing we can find among men is knowledge of ignorance regarding these matters as was said in the Apology, must we then not obey the opinion of the non-experts, i.e., the opinion of the many, i.e., the laws? That is a great question. Yes?

R: "And if we do not follow him ...I think it is true, Socrates."

S: Let us stop here. Now what is that which is damaged by injustice and improved by justice? What is that? What would you say? A: The soul. S: Pardon? A: The soul. S: The soul. And here we see something which is...will be very important for the dialogue as a whole. The soul is not mentioned. It is only that...the X, so to say. It is improved. We can...I use on such cases the expression abstraction from the soul. And I think abstraction from the soul is a characteristic of the Crito, and very important for the understanding of the Crito. Now let us see, there is a commentary of Burnet which is quite interesting. 47d 4. "That which was made better by right and destroyed by wrong. As the doctrine is assumed to be familiar even to Crito, Plato means us to understand that Socrates actually taught that the soul, psyche, was the seat of goodness and badness, a novel idea in the 5th century B.C. No doubt it is a novelty of the doctrine that makes him avoid the actual word soul in this passage." I think that's [next word sounds like "peak" or "pique."] I believe those of you who have read what we have read hitherto in this course know that Burnet's wrong. Namely? "It is the novelty of the doctrine that makes him avoid the actual word soul." Please. A: The Delphic Oracle. S: No. Not that. That's not the [level?]. Very simple. Yes. A: Crito's concern is with physical things, like money, not with things like the soul. S: No. Here we are concerned...let us stick to the point. A: He doesn't give the true explanation for his activity because the many won't understand it, and therefore he tells them... S: No. It's funny. How difficult it is to see the most elementary and obvious things. A: Isn't there a passage in Homer... S: No, but the question is what psyche means in Homer, whether it means...Oh no, Burnet is very learned. No, something which doesn't need any learning in order to see. Well

we have read the Apology. In the Apology he speaks two or three times of caring for the soul, and as the seat of all virtue. And I must say, one cannot...I'll give you the passages which I remember: 29e, 1-3 and 30b 1-2. And I might say, the beauty of that "no doubt" is transcendent. And that is . [Laughter-- which obscured the last word of the preceding sentence.] And the interesting question is, How is it possible that a man of the learning and intelligence of Burnet can make such a mistake like that? There is one point which one must respect very highly, that he is aware of the fact that this is a funny expression, just with which...which is improved by justice and ruined by injustice. You know? Instead of saying plainly, "The woul." That he has seen, and that is a merit. But the explanation he gives of that by a very far-fetched theory contradicted by the very sister work, The Apology, to which he wrote a long commentary, that is...one wouldn't believe if one did not know. That Plato might have deeper reasons for avoiding that word here when it is so obvious he doesn't even consider, because that is not the way in which he reads Plato. Plato isn't open book. And the only thing you need is of course, apart from thorough knowledge of Greek grammar and so on, is a knowledge of Greek science, and so on, of that time, which Burnet doubtless possessed, being an expert in that matter. So we, however, who are not so cock-sure, will say this is an occasion for wondering why does Plato avoid here, and also in the sequel, the word soul in this particular dialogue? Well, since we have a vacation now--and you will forget what I say now perhaps, the turkey and all the other good things--I will give you an answer, which I can immediately through the Laws, Plato's Laws. And there Burnet would say immediately, "Oh, the Laws were written much later, and therefore you can't use that for interpreting the Crito." To which I would reply, How do you know that Plato didn't think of something mentioned only in the Laws when he was already...how do you know he did not think of it when he was 20?

Now the key question is this: What is...men must honor. Everyone must honor certain things. The parents, the gods, the soul. And now at a certain passage in the Laws, which I will mention later on, when we read that we are compelled to raise the question, What does one have to honor most in case of conflict, the parents or the soul? And parents--father, and father-land (that is very closely akin as we will hear from this text). So what should one honor most in case of conflict? The soul or the city, the country? A problem which I believe is intelligible. And now by disregarding the soul, by abstracting from the soul, it is very easy to say one must obey the country right or wrong. And that is in a way the answer given to old Crito here, because that is best for him in this situation. In other situations it might be necessary to take it up. Good.

Yes? [question inaudible]. Yes, the exam. Well, since I, too, have been young once I understand your trepidations. Well it will be very simple. This course has sixteen meetings, 8 weeks quarter, and so on the seventeenth meeting-- today we have the twelfth, you can easily figure out with the help of a calendar-- we all will meet in this room at 3:30 and a question or maybe two questions will be dictated to you and you have to reply to them within...until 5 o'clock. And there will probably be a proctor. But I will give you a broad question. And everyone who has followed the course with normal intelligence and assiduity should have no difficulty in passing. That's all I can say. Because if I would go beyond that I think I would be responsible for something approaching a rigged examination. And as we know from the history of the Sanitary District in Chicago [laughter]...

Now we have had a long introduction, and therefore we must begin with a broader consideration. The Crito, as other Platonic dialogues, conveys a teaching or a message. As conveying a teaching it is a philosophic work. As conveying a message it is a poetic work. All Platonic books are both philosophic and poetic. Some people say more precisely that they are dramatic, but drama is of course a kind of poetry. They all present a logos, a reasoning, and an ergon, a deed. But in such a way that the logos must be understood in the light of the deed, and the reason being that deeds are more trustworthy than speeches. Since the deed is the poetic and the logos is the philosophic ingredient, this would seem that the philosophy is subordinated in the Platonic dialogues to poetry. This would seem to be absurd on the face of it. And it is absurd. There is a logos conveyed by the deed which is higher or deeper than the explicit logos. The logos conveyed by the deed could well have been stated by Plato as a logos. But for certain reasons Plato did not do that. Now this is in accordance with Plato's explicit logos regarding the relation between philosophy and poetry. And we know this view from the Apology-- you remember what Socrates said when he examined the poets--and we know it from the Ion, the Banquet, the Republic, and the Laws, and other places. Now this view of the relation between philosophy and poetry follows from the logos according to which the unexamined life is not worth living. The most human life, that is, is the life of the highest awareness, in contradistinction to, let us say, mysterious creativity of the highest order or mysterious expression of experiences. The poets give expression to radically different experiences, if I may use this present day expression. Think of the difference between Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, and Goethe. There is no possibility of a poetic argument between these poets. The differences among the philosophers are no less great than the difference among the poets, but there is in principle the possibility of a philosophic discussion of their views of man and of the whole. Now let us read one of the Platonic passages regarding poetry. And I think I'll take the passage in the tenth book of the Republic, 607b-c. Well, why don't you read it for us. Here it begins. This passage, incidentally, has a parallel in the Laws, in the last book of the Laws, 966a - 967c. Yes?

R: "Let us, then, conclude our return to the topic of poetry and our apology, and affirm that we really had good grounds then for dismissing her from our city, since such was her character. For reason constrained us. And let us further say to her, lest she condemn us for harshness and rusticity, that there is from of old a quarrel between philosophy and poetry. For such expressions as 'the yelping hound barking at her master and mighty in the idle babble of fools,' and 'the man

that masters those who are too wise for their own good,' and the subtle thinkers who reason that after all they are poor, and countless others are tokens of this ancient enmity. But nevertheless let it be declared that, if the mimetic and dilet poetry can show any reason for her existence in a well-governed city, we would gladly admit her, since we ourselves are very conscious of her spell. But all the same it would be impious to betray what we believe to be the truth." [Paul Shorey translation.]

S: I think we may stop here. Thank you. So Plato speaks here of that quarrel, that old quarrel or feud between philosophy and poetry. Now we have some evidence for that feud, for example among the fragments of Heraclitus speaking against Homer and for philosophy. But who speaks for the poets? These passages which Plato quotes here are of unknown source. There are some speculations. But they remind obviously of comic poetry rather than non-comical poetry. This language is not tragic in any way. The most famous document we have, stating the case for poetry against philosophy, is Aristophanes' Clouds, to which one would have to add also some of his other comedies if not all of them. Not the tragedies. They are of no use in this respect. And the reason is this, that the philosopher as philosopher is an object of comedy, ridiculous, as Plato himself said. He is not an object of pity; then he would belong to tragedy. And the second reason, which is [not? more or?] less important, is that the comic poet speaks about poetry, for he speaks about himself. This is of course not true of all comic poetry, but of classic Greek poetry which always contained a part called the parabasis, in which the chorus speaks in the name of the poet and frequently about the poet, about his poetry and his superiority to that of his rivals. There is no possibility for the tragic poet to speak about himself in his poetry in a tragedy. And the reason is that in a tragedy it would destroy the dramatic illusion, and that is fatal to the effect of tragedy. But the destruction of the comical illusion is itself comical, and therefore it is all right. Now there is a parallel to this difference between comic and tragic poetry among the two greatest pre-dramatic Greek poets. Homer does not speak about himself, and he cannot speak about himself. After all he is not...does not belong to the mythical age. He does speak about himself only indirectly, because in his works there occur characters who do what Homer does--the minstrels, and Odysseus, who also tells stories in the Homeric vein. In a way Homer speaks also--but that is less obvious--through his most general statement about the whole, namely, the shield of Achilles. But this is more complicated. The other great poet of Greek antiquity is Hesiod. Hesiod can speak about himself, and especially in his work called Works and Days, because he is not a mythical man, not a mythical hero, but a peasant or a son of a peasant, and having all kinds of troubles with his good-for-nothing brother, and so on. And this seems to be autobiographic. And perhaps it is. But it is much more than autobiographic. And they can do that. So Hesiod in this respect is closer to comedy than Homer is and perhaps the central position of Hesiod toward the end of the Apology, to which I drew your attention, is better understood in the light of this observation.

Now as for Aristophanes' critique of Socrates, of the philosopher, and Plato's reply to that critique, we may have an opportunity perhaps to speak about this interesting subject later on in this course. Now I will turn to the Crito in particular. Crito, you will remember, tries to persuade Socrates to escape from prison by adducing three reasons. First, Crito's reputation is going to suffer if Socrates will be executed. 2) Crito will not incur any monetary loss if Socrates

escapes. And three, it is Socrates' duty toward himself and his sons to escape. That is to say, Socrates and his friends will be regarded as worthless people if Socrates does not escape. Hence Crito and as he begins, with his concern with his reputation. We also saw that Crito forgets entirely Socrates' duty toward the city. Now Socrates' rejoinder, which we began to read last time. Socrates will follow the logos which on reasoning comes to eight to him as the best logos. He will be wholly uninfluenced by the present misfortune, because what is true and right remains true and right regardless of the situation in which you are. Crito is concerned with what people might think or may, with doxa in the two senses of the word--opinion and reputation. The logos to which Socrates appeals says some opinions are good and some are bad. The opinions of the knowers are good; those of the ignorant multitude are bad, and therefore do not deserve any respect. For instance one must respect the opinions of physicians and gymnastic trainers in the interest of the well being of one's body. And correspondingly and above all, one must respect the opinions of the knowers or experts regarding just, noble, and good things and the opposite in the interest of the well being of one's soul. Now--if there are such experts. According to the Apology there are no such experts because of [that?] ignorance. We have also observed that Socrates avoids the term "soul" here, and we will come back to that. And I only make this general remark, that he abstracts. Avoiding the term "soul" means that he abstracts from the soul, and we will see later on what that means. And I think at this point we should continue our reading of the Crito. 47e 7. If this is a good way to begin again. Yes. I think we'll begin here.

R: "Well then, if through yielding to the opinion...is the body, is it not? Yes."

S: You see he here in this case he spells it out; that which is affected positively or negatively is the body. All the more striking is the fact that he does not spell it out in the case of the soul. Yes?

R: "Then is life worth living when...Certainly not."

S: That is of course not entirely unimportant for the Crito. Because generally speaking deterioration of the body takes place when men get old, and Socrates puts a great emphasis on his being quite old. Yes.

R: "But is it worth living when that...and improved by the right?"

S: What is "that"? R: The soul. S: You see he avoids it again.

R: "Or do we think that part of us...But more important?"

S: "But more to be honored?" one could also say. You see again he avoids the soul. And quite manifestly, I mean that he is doing his best to make us see that he is doing just that. To live with a sick soul, that is of course implied, is much worse than death. And to anticipate the later argument, sickness of the soul is injustice, is disobeying the law. And hence one must not disobey the laws under any circumstances. Whether the argument is as simple as that remains to be seen. Yes?

R: "Then, most excellent friend,...and the good and their opposites."

S: Let us stop here. Now here Socrates concludes the first part of his argument. One must be concerned only with the view of the single expert regarding just and unjust things, and so on, or one must be concerned only with the truth itself. And one must do that in the interest of that part of oneself which is much more to be honored than our body. But we remember again the question, is there such an expert? In the sequel you will see this question will be dropped. It will be taken for granted that there is such an expert, or that there are such experts; that there are physicians and gymnastic trainers regarding the body. And this of course has to be contrasted with the depreciation of human knowledge that we observed in the Apology. Yes, let us go on.

R: "But it might, of course, be said that the many can put us to death."

S: "Someone might say." That is important; it's a kind of dialogue within the dialogue. And Burnet in his edition puts it into inverted commas to...as.. "Someone might say," yes?

R: "That is clear, too. It would be said, Socrates." S: No, "Someone might say." "You are right." Now Socrates makes here a nameless man--"someone"--raise an objection to his logos. It is a kind of dialogue within a dialogue and a device which Plato uses frequently. The objector belongs to the same kind of man as Crito. One must pay attention to the opinions of the many because the many have the power to kill. Socrates makes the objection because Crito is not able to do it. Crito was able to make a long speech setting forth his reasons, but he cannot contradict Socrates, at least no longer, not on the present occasion. A certain change is going on in him of which we will find further traces. Yes?

R: "That is true. But, my friend..." S: Not "my friend." Thaumasia, "You strange one." "You strange one." R: "But, you strange one...odd fellow. [laughter] the argument we have just finished...to consider most honorable.

S: For one second. You see here a clear transition of the distinction between the preceding argument which is now completed and a new argument which is now beginning. Yes?

R: "We do hold to it....do we hold to that, or not?"

S: Now that well and nobly and justly is the same, does this remain or does it not? It remains. Now let us consider the difference between these two logoi. The first is what one must do: the opinion of the experts in general, and therefore of the experts regarding the soul in particular. The following logos, not life as such but the good life is to be chosen, and the good life is identical with the noble life and identical with the just life. The preceding argument had admittedly abstracted from the power of the many, as you see because this reference to the power of the many came in at the end. The following logos, we must assume, will take the power of the many into account. And why is this the case? And the answer is this, as is already clear here but will become [clear? clearer?] in the sequel: The following logos, which begins here, abstracts from the possibility that there might be experts regarding the good, nobles, and just things. Now if this possibility is disregarded, then it follows that in the decisive respect all men, including such men as Socrates, belong to the many. And then of course it follows rather naturally, that one must obey the opinion of the majority. I mean that

is a very common sensible rule. If men are equal in the decisive respect, then in case of dissension the majority should have the way. Try to figure out for yourself if you would make the opposite rule. Say in the case of discord the vote of the minority would be valued. What would happen? Everyone would vote against his opinion. So the majority would appear as the minority and vice versa. There is no alternative to the majority principle in this sense: it is a dictate of reason. Good. And you can imagine that this is going to have very [great? grave?] consequences in the moment we forget now about the experts, i.e., about true knowledge in this field. Yes?

R: "Then we agree that the question is...but only the question of doing wrong."

S: Yes. Now since living well is identical with living nobly and with living justly, the only question of course is whether it is just to escape without the consent of the Athenians or not. Crito's consideration of money, reputation, and the upbringing of Socrates' sons, are utterly irrelevant. Even our very deaths are utterly irrelevant compared with this consideration. Yes?

R: "I think what you say is right, Socrates: but think what we should do."

S: Yes. You see that Crito agrees with ease to the complete destruction of his original argument. You remember where these three points--money, reputation, and Socrates' children--have been brought up. In a way the issue is already settled. But Socrates goes on. Yes?

R: "Let us, my good friend,...and I will yield to your arguments..."

S: Yes, that is very strange. A true *skopeis*, in the original meaning of the word, a consideration, looking at. The issue is not yet settled. But the mere contradiction on the part of Crito would be sufficient for Socrates to follow Crito's advice. Is Crito then an expert on justice so that we would obey Crito as we obey a physician? Hardly. I mean I think no one would ever suggest such a thing. But Socrates knows that Crito is not able to contradict, as we have seen before, at least not in the present situation. Now you must have seen, despite the translation, that Socrates uses here for example the expression "you good one." And in the line following, which we have not read, he calls him "you blessed one." I translate literally. Formerly he called him "you strange one," and "you best one." Now there is a strange density of adjectives in the vocative here. That occurred only once before in the Crito, in line 6, and will occur never after. Generally when Socrates addresses Crito, before or after he says, "O Crito," "O Crito," and does not use these adjectives. Now everyone who has ever read Platonic dialogues knows that these kind of appellations occur here and there. But it is very hard in the other cases known to me to see a principle there, although Plato surely didn't choose either the proper name or such an adjective in an entirely haphazard manner. Here I think we can understand it. The density of these vocatives, of these peculiar kind of vocatives, occurs first at the end of the argument regarding experts and it ends at the beginning of the consideration, the *skopeis*, as to whether it is just to escape from prison. That is to say, it occurs during the transition from the consideration of the experts to the substantive consideration based on the complete disregard of the expert. In other words it accompanies this change of atmosphere, from consideration of experts to their disregard. Per-

haps there is more to that, but this I think we can safely say. Now will you read what you just read, Mr. Reinken, the sentence...

R: "Let us, my good one,...and I will yield to your arguments:..."

S: "Your arguments" [something like "is not even said"/]; "I will obey," "I will follow you." Yes?

R: "...and I will obey:...and not contrary to your wishes."

S: Let us stop here. The translation doesn't bring out here that he says in both cases...He says first, "You say that I must go away against the will of the Athenians." And Socrates says, "I will not stay here against the will of Crito." The same word occurs. Socrates doesn't wish to run away against the will of the Athenians and he doesn't wish to stay against the will of Crito. Which means he wishes to reconcile Crito to the Athenians. Crito is in a state of inner rebellion and the purpose of the conversation is to reconcile Crito to the Athenians. And there he can appeal on various motives in Crito. Yes?

R: "Now see if the beginning of the investigation...to the best of your belief."

S: Now the beginning of the investigation, that has to be taken very literally. The major planners, the starting point, of the investigation. Yes?

R: "I will try....in some ways but not in others?"

S: Now let us stop here perhaps for a moment. The starting point of the inquiry is this: One must never, in any way, wrong anyone voluntarily. That is the starting point. And this is...that is of course here an opinion, not knowledge, because it is simply set forth. Now let us consider this for one moment. This opinion implies no one is to be blamed for wronging people involuntarily. For example if someone forces you by literally forcing your fingers to shoot and kill someone, no one would say you have murdered that man. In that case you do not wrong at all. But Socrates means much more than this by speaking of voluntarily here. You remember the argument in the Apology, 25a - 26a, no one corrupts anyone voluntarily, for no one chooses voluntarily what would harm him. And just as you would not make a dog simply vicious because he would jump at you first, you would not make human beings vicious because you would their victims. This argument is used there as you recall. Now we must replace, however, the word...in order to see what Socrates means, the word "voluntarily" with the word "knowingly." No one chooses knowingly what would harm him. This argument occurs, for example, in the Menno, 77c - 78a. No one chooses knowingly. We choose all the time wrong things without knowing, but no one chooses knowingly what would harm him. Which is a difficult proposition. If you think of such vices of smoking, people know that they shouldn't smoke and nevertheless smoke. We cannot go into this big question now but at any rate it is a common Socratic assertion. Now if the bad things are identical with the base things and with the just things it follows that no one chooses knowingly the unjust things. Or in other words, all unjust actions are involuntarily, a thesis discussed at some length in the Laws, 861c-d. Now if this is so, and that is a very paradoxical assertion, all acts of injustice, all bad choices, are involuntary since they proceed from ignorance. And hence only the

knower, only the expert regarding the good and just thing, can choose correctly. By speaking of voluntarily wrongdoing, Socrates reminds us therefore of the problem of the knower or the expert, which is here silently dropped; it is no longer the theme in this section. Good. And you will see he will drop this qualification voluntarily in the sequel, because we are reminded of the problem...the whole argument which follows is no longer valid. Yes. Now go on.

R: "Or, as we often agreed in former times, is it never right or honourable to do wrong?"

S: Now wait a moment here. "As we always agreed in former times and as we said also now." Or is this not in? Read Fowler's note.

R: "The words...as has just been said, too," follow in the MSS. but are omitted by Schanz and others."

S: And Burnet says no such statement has yet been made. But is this true? Has it not been said shortly before, that doing injustice...acting unjustly is under no circumstances good or noble? You only I think have to look at 48b 8-10 to see that the well and nobly and justly is the same. Does this remain or does it not remain? But you see the involuntary is now completely dropped. Yes?

I: "Or have all these former conclusions...that we were no better than children?"

S: Note the strong rhetorical appeal of this passage. "For a very long time, since decades, we have always agreed, and now when we are old, in this very short time now," since Socrates has been condemned, and when they are old they behave like little children who don't take seriously the results of their long conversations. Yes?

R: "Or is not what we used to say...this or not? We do."

S: So the key point here, the man who acts unjustly harms himself and disgraces himself. And then the first part is decisive--he harms himself, i.e., he is a great fool. If he knew what he was doing he would not do it. He acts unjustly because he does not know. Yes.

R: "Then we ought not to do wrong at all....Apparently not."

S: So now here he goes a step further. Since acting unjustly or doing wrong is bad, and hence base, we must of course not pay back an unjust action by acting unjustly on our part. That's I think a necessary consequence. Antidikein, to act against another man unjustly, is only a special case of acting unjustly in general. Yes?

Bruell: Isn't the case of a particular...the anger of a man would make him do something if he is wronged to revenge himself even though that revenge would be harmful to him, even though it would hurt him?

S: Is this not then a case of temporary blindness, i.e., ignorance?

Bruell: But I was just wondering if that is truly a phenomenon, if that truly

happens that a man willingly hurts himself in order to...

S: Does he do it willingly if he is blinded by passion? That would be a question, whether it is he who does it or something in him, which is not his true self. I do not say that Socrates' assertion is crystal clear, but it has some considerable plausibility. Good. Now let us see what he says in the sequel where he makes some progress. Yes?

R: "Well, Crito, ought one to do evil or not?"

S: Now "evil" must here be understood in an amoral sense, "inflict evil on others." That's not the same like wronging; wronging has the moral judgment, acting unjustly. Here it is only inflicting harm, inflicting evil. Yes?

R: "...to do ill or not?...Not right, certainly.

S: "Not right at all." Yes.

R: "For doing ill to people...That is true."

S: Now here he makes it a bit clearer what he means. Hitherto he had spoken of wronging, acting unjustly in general, and the word is understood by everyone at all times. But nevertheless it was unclear. Now he gives it some specific meaning. He says acting unjustly and inflicting harm on human beings is the same. So we know a bit about what it means to harm a human being, say, to cut off his hand, not to mention other lighter or severer harmings. But still it's nevertheless an identification which is striking. Is it true that acting unjustly is identical with inflicting harm on human beings? Yes?

A: Not always. harming them by punishing them...

S: Then you do not harm them. You harm their body and improve their soul at the same time. That's an easy case. [laughter] Yes?

Bolotin: Crito doesn't seem to think it is true because his principle of justice was to do what your enemies don't want.

S: No, not quite. That is more difficult. But something very simple. Can you identify acting unjustly with inflicting harm on human beings? I'm not speaking now of our dumb friends, which are omitted here, although one should also not inflict harm on dogs and cats--rats and mice are in a somewhat different [laughter, which covered over the next few words.] I do not want to go into this long question, but there is something much more obvious. A: Willingly, voluntarily. S: That has been dropped, which doesn't mean it has been forgotten. R: A small island with two tribes, both of whom need all the land on the island to live at all. S: Yes, we will come to this question of war. By all means. But something much more obvious for readers of the Apology. Yes? A: There are gods... S: Exactly. So in other words impiety is not a part of injustice. Now this can be defended easily by simply saying, "Well, these are two different virtues--justice here, piety there." But this is not quite so simple, because according to an equally common view piety is a sub-division of justice. It is surely noteworthy that this is the case. You see also that Socrates states it only negatively. He

does not say that acting justly means benefitting human beings. That's important. Yes?

Q: Could we bring up...Is it too early to bring up the problem of war and the fact that Socrates himself was a soldier and fought which...

S: I believe it would be wiser to postpone it until we come to that. But it is most relevant, no question.

Q: explain the relationship of the gods...impiety and acting unjustly ?

S: No, well according to a very common view, of which you find, for example in the *Euthyphro* and other places, justice means...How shall I say? Say, doing one's duty. And that consists obviously of two parts: doing one's duty toward the gods—piety, and doing one's duty toward human beings—justice in the narrower sense. But you can save Socrates from any embarrassment by simply saying he means here only justice in the narrow sense and of course make allowance for piety and . Yes?

Q: That about the case where one suffers injustice by choice? In other words he has the choice of either doing injustice or suffering, according to the Socratic dictum he suffers injustice. Is he harming himself? S: Give a concrete example. A: Well if someone says, "Kill him or you will be killed." You then choose to be killed. S: No, because only his body will suffer, and not his soul. Q: But you would only harm the other person's body. [Laughter] S: That is true, you may harm the other man...That is true. That leads to...In other words, if you kill his soul will...you will prevent him from corrupting his soul by preventing him from committing a crime. That's quite true. That's one of the many difficulties which he has to face sooner or later, but which are somehow swept under the rug for the time being. [Laughter] Yes. Now let us read the next sentence.

R: "Then we ought neither to requite wrong with wrong nor to do harm to anyone, no matter what he may have done to us."

S: Yes. This is even still stronger. One cannot injure any human being whatever, even that human being may inflict on oneself. For example one may not hit a slave who is killing one's own aged father [would be an example?], and war, naturally. And one could say provisionally, "Well, in a just war you do not hurt anybody even if you kill many enemy soldiers, because you only correct an unjust enemy." But whether that is sufficient we will see later. We have...This comes up quite naturally. Yes?

R: "And be careful, Crito....something you do not believe:..."

S: Or more literally, "against your opinion."

R: "...for I know that there are few who believe or ever will believe this."

S: You see. That is a very rare opinion. Yes?

R: "Now those who believe this,...no common ground of discussion,..."

S: "Deliberation" would be better. "Have no common deliberation."

R: "...but they must necessarily, in view of their opinions, despise one another."

S: All right, let us here...So this...that is the cleavage among men. Those who believe in absolute non-resistance and those who do not believe in it. But the interesting point is here this. There is no longer the cleavage or the gulf between the knowers and the non-knowers. This cleavage to which Socrates refers here is not the cleavage between philosophers and non-philosophers, but it somehow reflects that cleavage. Namely, those who hold that the unexamined life is not worth living, and those who hold that the unexamined life is worth living, also have no common ground of deliberation in the last resort. Which doesn't mean that they may have common ground of deliberation when they deliberate which sort of ties they should buy, and so on, but only in very important questions. Yes?

H: "Do you therefore consider very carefully...to this starting point?"

S: Now hitherto it has been left wholly undetermined what is just and good, or bad. Now one example is given. No, I'm sorry. I made a mistake. I said... No, Crito accepts this starting point. I'm sorry. Without any contradiction. And thereupon Socrates adds a qualification. One may defend oneself, as you see here. One may defend oneself. Hitherto it seemed that under no circumstances may you repel force by force, which is ordinarily regarded as a natural right. But here now he says, "You may defend yourself." But you may not do it by inflicting evil on the other one. Which leads then to the interesting case, if...which Locke once discussed, when the question came up whether one may execute a tyrannical king. And one of these writers of his time, I believe it was Berkeley, had said one must do it with due respect. And that is necessary. And Locke said he has nothing against his qualification but it is not very relevant once you...you know, whether the executioner does it with respect for his majesty or without respect for him. Good. Something of this difficulty seems here to be implied. Now let us go on.

R: "Or do you disagree and refuse your assent...hear the next point."

S: Next point. Now Socrates makes again a transition to...We should have a list where we note the steps of the argument, a new point comes in. Yes?

R: "I do hold to it...He ought to do it."

S: Yes. Now and from this...how does he go on next?

R: "Then consider whether,..."

S: Well, "From these things," namely, the premises now stated, "let us draw the conclusions." Hitherto it had been left wholly undetermined what is just or good. And somehow Socrates appealed to our general awareness or opinion of what is good and just. Now one example is given. It is unjust not to keep one's agreements. Provided of course they are just in the first place. But still this is singled out, this case is singled out because of its special importance. Now Burnet has here a note which... "Socrates is always represented," he says, "as

making this reservation. So in the first book of the Republic he insists that it is not right to give back a sword to a friend if he has gone mad when he asks it back, or to tell the truth to a friend in such a state." I suppose most of you know this discussion. But surely Socrates does not make the unqualified statement here. Socrates only asks the question, as you will see. That is of importance. Socrates asks a question; he does not...he explicitly says, "I rather raise the question." And now what are the conclusions? Socrates says, "Watch, look out, consider, on the basis of these things." Meaning, of these two premises; which are? One must not injure any human being under any circumstances, and second, one must keep one's just agreements with someone. Two premises from which the conclusion will be drawn in the sequel. Now read this please.

R: "Then consider from these, whether, if we go away...was right, or not."

S: So would Socrates and Crito by escaping from prison injure human beings? Would they keep their agreements if they did that? The difference between Socrates and Crito, as we see, is wholly irrelevant for deciding the issue. It is the act of Socrates and Crito. And you must also see...When he says, "Would we harm those whom we should harm least?" Injuring some human beings is graver than injuring others. And this leads then to a very interesting casuistry. At the top are people one must not...where it is extremely grave, and at the bottom is where it is of very little gravity, which introduces an element of "relativity" into this seemingly absolute argument. And now we hear what Crito has to say to this.

R: I cannot answer your question, Socrates, for I do not understand."

S: So what does this mean, that Crito does not understand Socrates' question? This is the only case of this kind in the Crito, the dialogue. It is inconceivable to Crito that in escaping from prison Socrates could injure any human being or break any agreement. Well, I believe we have some difficulties to see the difficulty because most of us have read the Crito before, and then we can't understand how anyone cannot understand this very simple argument. It is not as simple as we have partly seen. Yes?

R: "Consider it in this way...If, as I was on the point of running away..."

S: "We," "us," not "I."

R: "...we were on the point..." S: Now let us stop here. "We." Does Socrates mean that Crito, too, would have to leave Athens if Socrates is running away? And does he remind Crito of this most difficult implication? We do not know. Now begin again with this sentence.

R: "If, as we were on the point...so far as in you lies?"

S: Let us stop here. Now here begins the famous $\left[\right.$ sounds like "proso-popeia" in Greek, in literal translation, personification of the laws. Which is decisive for the rest of the argument. And we will soon see why this is the case. Socrates identifies here the laws and the commonwealth, as he translates quite well, literally, "the common of the city." And you see, "Tell me." That is the singular. That is of course the commonwealth. And then later he says "us." That is of course the laws. So he treats the city and the laws as identical. But

nevertheless in the sequel, the emphasis is altogether on the laws rather than the city. There are some remarks of Burnet which are of some interest. On to koinon tes . "The state. The commonwealth." But the state and the commonwealth are very different concepts. "The phrase marks at least the beginning of the idea that the state as such was a juristic personality or corporation, a view not as a rule clearly grasped by the Athenians or the Greeks generally." Well one would only have to try to translate the "juristic personality" into Greek to see that there is no place for that notion. What that is is very hard to say. Well we all know what they mean. A juristic personality is a person who can act, for example, own property. A city can own property. A city can do all other kinds of acts of legal validity or invalidity, of legal relevance. And that makes it a juristic personality as distinguished from a merely natural person like any of us. But that would be very hard to express the thought in Greek and to find its classical Greek equivalent. More important is the following observation which Burnet makes here in this context: "The personification of the laws, who are of course to be pictured as august male figures," because the word nomos is masculine in Greek. Yes, that is indeed very interesting. Of what does it remind us, when we see here these august male figures at the end of the dialogue? Yes? Bruehl: The woman at the beginning. S: Exactly. It begins with a woman at the beginning, you know? Who appears to Socrates in a dream. And it ends then... In other words there are no gods, but they are like gods, both. Yes. Now in the meantime I reminded myself of a passage which I had completely forgotten in Xenophon's Memorabilia, Book II, chapter 1, paragraph 22, ff. Is this correct? Well, here Xenophon tells the famous stories of Hercules at the crossroads, written in imitation of a speech made by the famous sophist Prodicus. And in this connection we find also a woman dressed in white, as that woman was at the beginning of the Crito. Who was that? Well I think I'll just read to you from the translation, which is not very good. Xenophon's remark. "When Hercules was passing from boyhood to youth, a state wherein the young now becoming their own masters show whether they will approach life by the path of virtue or the path of vice, he went out into a quiet place and sat pondering which road to take. And there appeared two women of great stature making toward him. The one was fair to see and of high bearing and her limbs were adorned with purity, her eyes with modesty. Sober was her figure and her robe was white. The other was plump and soft with high feeling. Her face was made up to lighten its white and pink, her figure to exaggerate her height. Open eyed was she, and dressed so as to disclose all her charms." [Laughter] "Now she eyed herself [anon? and now?] she looked whether any noticed her and often stole a glance at her own shadow." Now who is that white dressed woman? Virtue. And I think we should consider the possibility that the woman who appeared to Socrates at the beginning of the Crito is Virtue. And then at the end there appear the laws. And this would force us to raise the question, What precisely is the relation between virtue and the laws? Now the laws are of course here the Athenian laws, [as appears from the context?], and what would be then the question which we would have to address to the Athenian laws even apart from this Xenophonic passage? What question would we have to address to the Athenian laws? A: Are they virtuous? S: Do they lead to virtue? And if they do not lead to virtue, what would be the consequence of that? Well, they are not very respectable. That is safe to say. Because that is axiomatic for men like Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, that the function of laws is to make men virtuous. And if they don't do it and even do not aim at doing it, then that is a very great defect. And needless to say that this would affect adversely the argument of Socrates in the sequel, although not the action he will undertake in the circum-

stances. Now where were we? -es. No, let us...head again. "Tell me, Socrates, what..."

R: "Tell me, Socrates, what have you...and others of the same kind?"

S: You will see immediately or have already seen that Crito is not given an opportunity to reply to this question. Perhaps we are bidden to think of the fact that cities survive what we now call revolution, what the Greeks called [staseis?], in which it happened quite frequently that prisons were opened, and yet the cities survived all right, you know? Despite the fact that the decisions of the courts lost their practical validity. At any rate it is remarkable that Crito is not given an opportunity to reply to this question. Yes.

R: "For one might say many things,...shall be valid."

S: You see this particular law. He is not speaking here of laws in general. He doesn't say here any more than the polis will be destroyed by that, but this particular law. Here is a point in Burnet which I think we should also consider. On the passage 50b 8. "The law passed after the amnesty," after the restoration of the democracy, "the decisions by the court which have been made while the city was ruled democratically, would apply a fortiori to judicial decisions decided after the restoration of the democracy." [Placement of quotation marks a matter of guessing.] That may well be the case but was Socrates a democrat? That would be the question which we would have to consider here. Yes?

R: "Or shall we say to them,...by Zeus, Socrates."

S: Is this not amazing? Did Socrates not make it, I don't say crystal clear, but very clear, that one must not under any circumstances give tit for tat, do wrong to someone who has done one wrong? And Crito had fully agreed with that. And now here and in this passage he restates this rejected opinion. How do we explain it? That is Crito's sole objection to the trend of Socrates' argument, and is much stronger worded than the parallel in 48a 3-11. Yes, you had an answer.

Schaeffer: No, I had a question. [Laughter] Why is this necessarily giving tit for tat? I mean if this is not really giving harm?

S: No, the polis hurt us, wronged us. And why should we not hit back? Hurt her?

Schaeffer: I mean is it necessarily hurting the polis? Or is it simply saving the polis from doing injustice?

S: But no...But Crito doesn't start any argument. The mere fact that the city did injustice to us gives the right to react in this way. I believe there is every simple reason for that. Injustices had been defined before. Doing harm to human beings. Is the polis, or are the laws, human beings? The polis...You can say the polis is a multitude of human beings, but to quote again the expression used by Burnet, "a juristic personality" cannot be identical with a mere multitude, but is a peculiar form of unit. Clearly the laws, these august super-human figures, are no human beings. In other words the advantage which Socrates derives from the

personification, to present the laws as more than life-size, has also the disadvantage that you may forget the massive, primary fact that the laws are made by human beings for human beings. You see that is a difficulty which follows from the personification. But someone here raised his hand or her hand. You.

A: You've already answered my question. S: Pardon? A: You've already answered my question. I was going to ask about the laws being for human beings. S: Well this is of course no longer visible when the laws are in this way personified. Good. Although the personification makes, of course, some sense. Otherwise one would have to have recourse to the passage in 49d where Socrates spoke of the fact that there is no common ground between those who say you can hit back if hurt and those who deny that. You remember that passage? Which would be very bad for Crito if there would be no common deliberation, and then there could be no Crito, I mean no dialogue Crito. So that is less attractive, I believe. Yes?

R: "What then if the laws should say,...perhaps they would continue,..."

S: Now let us stop for a moment. It is not sufficient to say that Socrates, as far as in him lies, would destroy the city by running away. It is necessary that the law commanding respect for the judicial decision be based on an agreement between the laws and Socrates. That is an addition necessary. What this means we must see in the sequel. Yes.

R: "...Don't be surprised at what we say,...question and answer."

S: All the "method" is of course a wholly gratuitous addition. "Since you are accustomed to ask the questioning and answering." The laws, you see, do not directly reply to the objection that there was no such agreement ever between Socrates and the laws regarding the sanctity of the judicial decisions. Yes?

F: "Come, what fault do you find with us... 'I find no fault,' I should say."

S: Let us stop here. So the laws presuppose, but only presuppose--that has never been proven--that trying to escape is trying to destroy the laws and the city altogether. But here the first argument which they make now raises of course a question, that Socrates owed his respectability to the fact that he was not born out of wedlock is undeniable, because in former times people took this quite seriously as you know. But nevertheless the laws say much more than that. The laws say that they generated Socrates, whereas in fact who generated Socrates?

A: His mother and father. S: Yes. And this generation of men by man is still called a natural phenomenon, natural phenomenon. Now here if the laws claim that they have generated Socrates, the difference between nature and law is abolished, tacitly and with very great consequences. Yes?

R: "Or with those that have to do... You did, 'I should say.'"

S: Good. Now there are two questions here and only the second one is answered. The highest part of Socrates' education, of course, is not due to the laws. I mean this general education which every, or almost every Athenian child got. That might be due to the laws. But to whom is Socrates' higher education, which is much more... much more valuable to him than music and gymnastics as demanded by law, to whom was that due? A: The gods? S: Yes. The Oracle in Delphi, you can say, if you want to you can say that. And... But on the other hand

you have to add immediately that the Oracle in Delphi was only a response to Chaerophon's question. Surely it was not due to the city of Athens. Now this question is discussed in the Republic in §20b. We will perhaps read that if I have the Republic. We might read that. Well I'll simply read to you the translation. The discussion is that the philosophers...Socrates says, "We shall not be wronging the philosophers who arise among us," by demanding from them political acts, service, "but that we can justify our action when we constrain them to take charge of the other citizens and be their guardians. For we will say to them that it is natural that men of similar quality who spring up in other cities," i.e., not the perfect city of the Republic, "should not share in the labors there. For they grow up spontaneously from no volition of the government in the several cities, and it is justice that the self-grown, indebted to none for its breeding, should not be zealous either to pay to anyone the price of its nurture." [Paul Shorey translation.] Socrates, in other words, was the best in his not to any action of the city of Athens or of the laws of Athens, however good the elementary instruction provided by the city of Athens may have been. Now let us go on in §50c, where we were.

R: "all than, when you were born...you yourself and your ancestors?"

S: So the laws generated not only that individual Socrates, they generated all Athenians from the very beginning, i.e., the ponoi generated Athens. Hence every Athenian belongs all together, body and soul, to the laws, is their slave. I think now we understand somewhat better why there was no reference in §50c to the principle that one must not do a wrong in return of any...to any human being. For the reason that we have to deal only with a special case of wronging in response, namely, wronging in response to one's superiors, to one's masters. That is the nerve of the argument now. You do not have to go into the general question whether you may not wrong any human beings in any circumstances. This is...but only whether you may not wrong any of your superiors or masters. Yes?

R: "And if this is so, do you think...you who really care for virtue?"

S: With the implication, "you who talk all the time about your caring for virtue." Now in order to understand that a bit better, the word "country" is in Greek patris, which means fatherland, so the transition from the father to the fatherland is quite obvious. There is no equality whatever between the laws of the city, fatherland, and the individual. Unqualified obedience is the only thing which one has to do. At least unqualified passive obedience. If your father strikes you, insult you, or does anything--or blinds you, for that matter, kills you--you are not permitted to do anything against him. And hence of course no possibility whatever to rebel or to protest against judicial decisions legally made. Because if they are illegally made they are not backed by the laws, and if they are legally made then nothing can be done. Now we'll read the sequel next time. The point which Socrates is going to make in the sequel is this: Not only passive obedience--meaning that you have to suffer--but also active obedience. You have to do anything the laws or the city tells you to do. There is one alternative, of course, pointed out by Socrates. You are entitled to persuade the city to desist from its unjust course. But if you fail in your persuasion, in your attempt at persuasion, what do you have to do? You have to obey. So. Unqualified, active and passive obedience, this is the message of the laws. And whether this is Plato

or Socrates' serious and final suggestion regarding this very grave issue, that is a question which we will have to consider of course. Usually when one discusses this in the light of the Republic or the Laws, you will get the answer, "Well this was written by Plato...These words were written by Plato a decade or decades later and he changed his mind." Therefore we have to consider especially the Apology where everyone agrees that it belongs together in time as well as in any other respect with the Crito. Now what does the Apology say? Does Socrates teach there, one must obey the city unconditionally?

A: He says that if they order him to desist from philosophizing he won't.

S: I see. So at least one example is perfectly sufficient to destroy the . If the city could of course, if it had the power somehow, to forbid philosophizing. And Socrates would not obey the polis then. Whether this is the only case where Socrates would not obey the law is a long question. It would apply of course to such interesting cases as wars, where one would have to make a distinction, however, between what kinds of wars, and we will take this up next time.

Now let us see where we were. Now let us first summarize what we have discussed last time. Socrates' argument against Crito. First one must obey the expert rather than the many regarding the good, noble, and just things. If there is such an expert. But is there such an expert? Now if there is no such expert the consequence would be--at least I would be so bold as to draw it now--one must obey the laws. But are not the laws the opinions of the multitude? And is this...the possibility of the judgment of the expert not a threat to the authority of the laws? Therefore Socrates' next step. He drops the consideration of the experts and asserts that one must not wrong anyone in any circumstances. That is to say, one must not inflict harm on anyone in any circumstances, regardless of what the other fellow has done to you first. So here we have forgotten about the experts, but still the expert problem remains, for who is competent to determine what is and what is not harming? Socrates' secondly asserts that one must fill one's agreements, provided they are just. Again, who is competent to determine what is just? The questions are relatively easy once you assume the validity of the laws. But this validity is questioned by this vague possibility of a supra-legal understanding.

The next step in Socrates' argument is the personification of the city and the laws. Personification means literally making them persons. But not in any metaphysical sense of the word. But making them characters, as in a play. [Prosopoi?] in Greek. Aristophanes, for example, makes dances an individual. You know, an oddish, rather fat, lazy fellow, good natured but not very bright. Or war--politics, or [irony?]--peace, or and, force and violence. Now we have been reminded by Burnet of the modern notion of a juridical personality, which is something very different from a personification. For example, like a corporation which is a juridical personality, and so on. Now I thought we should remind ourselves for one moment of the most important statement regarding juridical personality, which is not to be found in any recent legal text but in Hobbes, especially in the Leviathan. I'll read to you the passage, chapter 17. "The commonwealth, to define it, is one person, of whose acts a great multitude, by mutual covenants one with another, have made themselves every one the author to the and his," namely, the commonwealth, "may use the strength and means of them all, as he shall think expedient for their peace and common defense." This is the first definition of the political community, of the commonwealth, of the state, in which it is defined as a person. Now what does Hobbes mean when he calls the commonwealth a person? As is indicated in the wording of his definition and developed at some length in the whole chapter, the meaning is that the individual is completely absorbed into the commonwealth. What the commonwealth does to me, regardless of what it does, I do to myself. My will has been completely absorbed by the social contract into the will of the commonwealth. And now there is the old legal rule, volenti non fit injuria [!], to him who wills no wrong is done. And therefore of course the state can do you no wrong because you have authorized it in advance to do to you whatever it thinks expedient. Now the rationale of the Hobbesian notion of the state as a person is, the rationale, that is, of the absorption, of the complete absorption of the individual by society, is the assumption that death is the greatest evil. And therefore anarchy, civil war, or anything like it, must be avoided by all means. Law and order at every cost, at every price. Therefore there must be no possibility for the individual to appeal from the commonwealth, from its laws, to higher laws. You know? This is an anarchic element. Necessarily. And, well, but Hobbes gets into great troubles. He

has made this beautiful construction of the Levisthan, which has absorbed the will of everyone because everyone wants to avoid violent death—at least if he is in his senses, that is a minor difficulty. And so what you have to do is to obey the laws as Socrates demands, whatever they command you to do. But what is the trouble into which Hobbes comes, precisely because his starting point is that death is the greatest evil? Well, you... *[Answer insubible]* Yes, very simply. Now what does Hobbes say on this subject? A: You can disobey the state. S: Yes. You entered society, political society, in order to protect yourself against dying. And therefore if that civil society turns against you, endangers your life, you are perfectly entitled to disobey. And Hobbes is consistent enough to say that even if you are a justly condemned murderer, let us say, you have the right, the natural right, to kill the guards, get out of jail, kill everyone, in order only to save dear life, which is of course not a very good solution. Now it is... Hobbes has very much to do with this subject we are discussing, because he developed his whole position, and that means by implication also the positions of man like Locke and Rousseau later, in opposition to Socrates' "enarchism," the enarchism being the fault that according to Socrates and his followers Plato, and Aristotle, and so on, it is possible to appeal from the positive law to something like natural right. And there is no possibility of finding an elegant and simple solution to this difficulty. Because the question is always, who is competent to judge? There are no legally definable criteria. Or if they are they are as much positive law as anything else and are therefore objectionable. The simple sign and the most obvious sign of the opposition between Hobbes and the whole tradition is that from Hobbes' point of view it is impossible to make a distinction between king and tyrant. Because that is... A king whom you do not like, that is a tyrant; that is what Hobbes says. There is no objective distinction.

Now what then does Socrates mean by his seemingly identical statement in the Crito? Socrates who surely was not a Hobbiist. Now the personification of the laws is a poetic device and not a legal concept. This much is clear. And we have to compare the laws at the end with the woman at the beginning of the Crito. And we may perhaps say that since the woman is not described as in any way repulsive, she might be understood as an object of desire. And surely nothing of this kind could be said of the *nomoi* at the end, the laws at the end. The personification raises the laws high above men. Hence one... And this leads to the consequence that one cannot be under any obligation not to wrong the laws. That would be as absurd as to say that you can wrong the gods. Or more simply stated, to wrong someone was said to do harm to human beings; the laws, as they appear at the end of the Crito, are surely not human beings. Or, one cannot wrong them, cannot harm them, because they are so high above us. The laws here take the place of the gods, and one would have to wonder why they take the place of the gods. Well, the argument in favor of the absoluteness of the laws is based on the analogy between... the relation between the child and the parents, especially the father. And since... just as you have to obey your father and not to hit him back when he hits you, not to insult him after he has insulted you. The same applies a fortiori to the fatherland as you may recall. And why does Socrates replace then the laws by the gods? I would say, well, the most famous of the gods, the highest god, Zeus, was not a model son. He bound his father, you know and acted against him, and this is one good reason why one should not speak very much about Zeus here. At any rate the laws make sure that Socrates approves of certain Athenian laws, namely the laws regarding marriage and regarding elementary education. Socrates therefore must be grateful for the benefits which accrue to him by virtue of those laws. That is perfectly sensible. But

then they suddenly jump at the conclusion that Socrates is altogether their slave. In other words if you have received some respectable benefits from someone else, be they even the laws, this is not a reason for being the slave of that someone else. How can Socrates make that jump? And in order to see how this is possible, we shall turn to the sequel where we left off last time. And that was 51a 7. Now let us see, is this correct? R: Yes, page 179. S: Now read very slowly please.

R: "Or is your wisdom such that you do not see...you must do whatever the city, your fatherland, commands..."

S: No, "the city and the fatherland." Yes.

R: "...or must show her by persuasion what is really right..."

S: "What is by nature right."

R: "...right by nature, but that it is impious...I think they do."

S: Now let us stop here. So Socrates had said before that there is a duty of unqualified obedience, at least unqualified passive obedience. Now he goes beyond that and makes it clear beyond a shadow of doubt that it is man's duty to pay unqualified active obedience as well. Whatever the polis commands you. If you cannot persuade the polis of the injustices of its commands. And the injustice would mean of course of the fact that its commands are intrinsically unjust, by nature unjust. This is a great question of the difference between positive law and natural right. You know, or may know, that something the city's commanding you to do is by nature wrong, and you oppose that to the unjust command of the city. And you try to persuade the city. But if you fail to do so, then you have to obey. Well, there is a famous case of Mitylene told in Thucydides history, where the Athenians decided under the leadership of Cleon, to destroy the city because it had rebelled against Athens. To kill all men and to sell all women into slavery, an atrocious decision. According to what Socrates says here Socrates would have to go there and participate in the killing and enslaving. Well in this particular case the Athenian demos reconsidered the case and then by some piece of good luck a day or two later they rescinded their decision and by the very greatest efforts of some Athenian sailors the second ship which brought the good news arrived in time. But it was touch and go. But this is a wonderful accident. But the main point which Socrates makes is in such a case there is no possibility except to obey the city. Now there are more questions than that. You also have seen that the issue is now completely settled to Crito's satisfaction. One must obey the laws and then one. Socrates can of course not escape from prison. As for the difficulty, I'll read to you one passage from the beginning of the fifth book of the Laws. "Let everyone who has just heard the ordinances concerning gods and dear ancestors," which includes of course the parents, "now give ear. Of all a man's own belongings the most divine is his soul since it is most his own. A man's own belongings are invariably twofold: the stronger and better are the ruling elements, the weaker and worse those that serve. Wherefore of one's own belongings one must honor those that rule above those that serve. Thus it is that in obeying man to honor their own souls next after the gods who rule and the secondary divinities, I am giving a right injunction." And so on. Did you notice anything? It is hard when it is only read once. Yes?

A: The first time he said honor the souls highest, and the second time he

said honor the souls second after the gods.

S: No, first he had said...I mean he alluded to it at the very beginning. What he had said before regarding honoring the gods and the ancestors, let us say, gods and parents. And now he speaks of the soul; he says we must honor first the gods and then the soul. Is this s...did you notice that?

Wolfowitz: In the beginning doesn't he say the most divine is the soul?

S: In us. In us. So..what did you want...

R: But it comes in ahead of the parents, you said.

Parents ahead
Problem of Crito
Apology
S: That is not clear. It is indicated as a problem. That the gods occupy the top place is not questioned. But then the question is, Who comes first in case of conflict, the parents or the soul? This is here only implicitly stated as a question and that question is underlying the whole Crito. And why does it not become an explicit question in the Crito we know already the fact. The abstraction from the soul in the Crito in passages where it was natural to speak of the soul and inevitable to speak of the soul, Socrates or Plato deliberately avoids the word "soul" and says only...uses only paraphrastic expressions in order to draw our attention to this disregard of the soul. Once you consider the soul you cannot accept the argument of the Crito. And that is a point which we know also from the Apology, where Socrates makes one key qualification against the claim of the laws: If the laws would forbid him to philosophize he would not obey the laws. This is the most manifest contradiction between what is explicitly said in the Apology and what is explicitly said in the Crito. According to the Apology Socrates makes a crucial qualification regarding the claims of the laws, and this crucial qualification is omitted in the Crito. And well therefore, as I read in one of Shorey's statements, there are people it seems who like the Apology and do not like the Crito, and the other way around. Now the one I suppose are the liberals, who like the Apology, and the conservatives like the Crito. But in order to do justice to Socrates or Plato, one must like both. And that means one must try as well as one can to reconcile this contradiction.

Now there is a point which Burnet makes to 51b 3. He notes that in 51b 3, if you have that before you in the Greek text, this "either persuasion," a *peithein*, is bracketed by one of the editors on the ground that it is repeated below in c 1. And this leads to certain difficulties. And therefore Burnet, as a sensible man, keeps it in the text. But I think it is more important to realize that in the first case, he says "first persuade," and in the second "do." "If you can't persuade." And in the repetition he speaks first of doing and then of persuading the city as to what is by nature just. Yes. I think we can...Of course this persuasion can be done only by someone who knows what is by nature just, i.e., by the knower or by the expert. And we have...But this expert has been completely forgotten. We have abstracted from him in this part of the argument, just as we have abstracted throughout from the soul. Now is there a connection between abstraction from the soul and abstraction from the expert, the knower? A: It's the soul who knows. S: Pardon? A: Without the soul there wouldn't be very much knowing. S: Yes. One could...Yes. All right, let us say the highest part of the soul is the understanding, that by virtue of which a man can be a knower or expert. Yes. Incidentally this absolute obedience to obey the father which is the basis of the argu-

ment in this section, in this part of the Crito. This of course leads also to questions, I mean and disregarding entirely modern preoccupations with rights of juvenile delinquents, completely disregarding these things, these new-fangled things, but serious questions existing at all times. For example, if the father is insane and tries to kill your mother, must you just remain the obedient son and not do anything, not use any violence? Or even in the case of drunkenness of the father, some resistance might be in order. And this shows again how difficult and insufficient these general statements of Socrates are. We will later on try to state the simple principle underlying these sweeping statements, which are good enough for most purposes but not for all, like honor father and mother. Yes!

Q: How would Socrates justify his disobedience to the Thirty, when they ordered him to go get Leon? S: To whom? Q: To the Thirty. S: Oh, that's easy. They were an illegitimate government. A: But here he says you should do whatever the city commands; he doesn't say anything about . S: All right. Then let us say...how would this be stated in strict terms? The defect of the Socratic argument here? I mean who commands? Who legislates? A: I don't understand. A: The tyrants didn't represent the city. S: All right. Let us assume that. But in every city, in every commonwealth, there is a legislator, obviously, who is behind all laws. And is this legislator simply the city? [Inaudible reply] That would be more or less the same, the sovereign, but there is a problem concealed by these words, namely, what is concealed is what the Greek called the politela in contradistinction to the polis. [Writes on blackboard] Politela. That, incidentally, is the title of Plato's Republic in the original. And that has a variety of meanings. The only meaning with which we are concerned now is this, that the politela—which I translate by "regime"—is that which gives a city its character, its form, its moral tone. You are never confronted by the polis without a politela, without a regime. You are always confronted with a polis formed, dedicated to a specific purpose. Take a simple case from present day life. We are supposed to be loyal to the United States. But that means of course we are supposed to be loyal to the United States as constituted under the U.S. Constitution as interpreted authoritatively by the Supreme Court now. If someone would say "out of loyalty to the United States I become an active Communist or Nazi," he would not be accepted. Because loyalty never means loyalty to the mere, to the bare country. It means always loyalty to the country as politically constituted. We have some difficulties in understanding this thing. Not in our practical life, but theoretical. And the reason is, for example, the modern concept of the state, which conceals this crucial question of the variety of regimes. For example, the ordinary translation of this word is "constitution." Quite a few people speak of the history of the British constitution, let us say. This means there is a British constitution which started, well when? When the Anglo Saxons came to Britain, probably. Or maybe even already under King Arthur and so on. And then which underwent all kinds of changes, but it is fundamentally the British constitution. This is wholly alien to the classical concept of the regime, as comes particularly clear in Aristotle's statement in the Politics that if the regime changes the result is that there is no longer the same city. Aristotle starts from this observation in the third book of the Politics, the most important part of the Politics. When there was a tyrant or an oligarchic clique in control and they have been disposed of by a revolution, then the people say afterwards, "Oh we don't pay these debts, because not the city incurred them but the tyrant, or the clique." The democrats imply, therefore, that as long as the tyranny lasted there was no city—which doesn't mean there was not a town and houses and all kinds of other things. But

the polis as a political thing did not exist. So this view then is--and we can generalize from that--the oligarchs would then say, if they are consistent, if there is no oligarchy there is no polis. Or they would probably not use that term. For some reasons they would say, "The city has gone to pieces." But one could rightly say that a city which has gone to pieces is no longer a city. Does it not make sense? Could you not say of an earthen vessel when it has gone to pieces that it is no longer an earthen vessel? Good. So. And now. If we... Aristotle is confronted with the fact that the partisan, as we may call him, the democratic, oligarchic, or whatever he may be, that the partisan will identify the polis with a polis constructed according to his notion, his partisan notion of justice, democratic, oligarchic, monarchic, or whatever it may be. And this is of course not sufficient for a man or a philosopher who is not a partisan but impartial. And Aristotle in his wisdom therefore says, "It is not true that the city has disappeared, has gone to pieces when a change of regime takes place, when a revolution takes place, but that the city has been replaced by another city." This is still hard for us to swallow because would we not say that it is still the same England, whether Henry VIII or Elizabeth I rules or Elizabeth II? and Aristotle would say, "Well in a sense, sure." [Laughter] "But not in the decisive respect." That would be his point. Because that to which the England of Elizabeth I was dedicated is not that to which the England of Elizabeth II is dedicated. And this could easily be proven by looking at some famous enactments made under the two queens. You know, in other words Aristotle takes his bearing by what is highest, that to which people are dedicated, and not to the matter, as he puts it. I mean the Thames is the Thames and the lake country is the lake country, and so on, in England. The matter is the same and they are still racially more or less the same. This is not the highest kind of thing in which you have to look at political phenomena, English or not English. Yes?

Q: If you change the regime, but without a revolution, let's say you amend the original constitution and have a regime which is entirely different from the original but it's changed...

S: Well, if you mean by revolution the use of violence, that is relatively unimportant.

Q: Let's say you amend the constitution.

S: What does that mean? I mean we have then the... You see, I deliberately translate it not as is usually done by "constitution" where you think especially in this country of a legal document, but by "regime." You see a legal document like the U.S. Constitution may be amended and this amendment may not be of radical political importance. You have to consider... You have to look at it not from the point of view of a lawyer but from a political point of view. Now let us assume an amendment. The original Constitution had a very severe property qualification. Then of course it was not a democracy. This is a fictitious example in the case of the United States as I know from Mr. Diamond, but it could have been. [Laughter] It could have been that the founding fathers had not been unqualified democrats. And then if there had been an amendment which took away at one stroke the property qualification and therefore transformed the non-democratic regime into a democratic regime, then there was a qualitative, essential change. Does this make sense? Now of course if you take such interesting sub-forms like whether women have the voting right or not, whether these are radical changes may be doubted,

especially in Protestant countries. You know in Catholic countries there was always a great objection to woman's votes because of the alleged addiction of the woman to priestly rule, and this would of course then be politically relevant. [Laughter] I mean ask an old French Radical Socialist, you know, why they were opposed to the vote of women. So one must be a bit more subtle and make all kinds of distinctions then Aristotle was compelled to make in entirely different circumstances. At that time no one thought of the vote of women. And there are other considerations. For example, if you enlarge the vote including juveniles, on the basis of the principle stated by the former President Eisenhower—who is old enough to fight is old enough to vote, if this is a wise principle—than whether this is politically important or not, that depends. It is possible that such a change may transform a moderate democracy into an extreme democracy. Well you have to know the facts in order to judge properly. It's possible, but if it has this effect then it is a politically important change.

Q: I was just curious when you mentioned loyalty before, what we have our loyalties...and the question again of Hitler. If he came to power legally and there wasn't a constitutional change then a person would still be loyal to him even though there's been...

S: Yes, but still at a certain point doubtless the Nazi regime was dedicated to objectives different from those of the Weimar Constitution. And this was...to have this legal transformation was only a shrewd political device. You know, that everything is legal. But of course no man in his senses was fooled about the fact that one Germany, say Weimar Republic, was replaced by another Germany, although the rivers, the forests, and so on, remained all the same. And for us this is no longer convincing, so obvious as it was for the Greek, because we are in a sense less political than they were. You see our point. I mean because we...For example the whole notion of social, of society in contradistinction to the state, and regarding society as the most important point, has very much to do with the de-politicization of our . That the emphasis shifts from the politically relevant, the objectives of the society as politically organized, as politically constituted, to other things, whatever the things may be. What is true of the concept of society is of course also true of the concept of culture or civilization, however you call it. Yes?

Enotins: I'm not sure again how this applies to the example of Leon. Does that mean that you're only supposed to be loyal to the city constituted so that the regime is proper?

S: No, there is...You see the trouble is that whenever you go into specific questions, say one of Leon of Salamis, and listen to what Socrates says on this occasion, then you are confronted with a practical decision using, among other things, legal arguments which are not necessarily of the highest theoretical character. [About this point something went wrong with the recorder causing a continuous buzzing sound on the tape, which sometimes interferes with the voices.] Now starting from very low, theoretically low I mean, here was a regime which seemed to be very promising. You must not forget that Plato, young Plato, about 20 years old, was very interested in what these guys like Critias and Charmides and so did, you know? And then they proved to be gangsters of the worst kind, these men who established a rule of justice and virtue—similar to what happened in Germany in 1933 to some extent. And now then Socrates didn't wish to have anything

to do with these people: they misbehaved much more than democracy at its worst. It was so bad that Plato, who was not a lover of Athenian democracy, said that in the light of the conduct of his own relatives there the old democracy looked like the golden age, which it surely was not. But it was so terrible. So in other words...the prevailing view a few months after the revolution was of course that the laws, the old laws, are still valid. You know? He appealed to those laws which had lost their political basis by virtue of the change of regime, and I suppose it played a...If there had been a similar situation under the democracy, that the democracy would have used individual citizens as hangmen, so to speak, Socrates I'm sure would also have objected to it. But fortunately the Athenian laws did not use individual citizens who wanted to lead a private life as hangmen. So you have to in order to form a fair judgment you would have to take in the whole situation and to compare comparable things. Now the things with which Socrates compares his conduct under the Thirty is what he did under the democracy on the occasion of the trial of the generals of the Battle of the Arginusae. Now here it was so that, according to Socrates' or Plato's presentation, the Athenian assembly, democratic assembly, behaved illegally by condemning them altogether instead of condemning or judging everyone individually. But here he was unable...That was a common principle. What Socrates does not make clear in that context, because it was not necessary, is the complication regarding the political background of the laws. But we have to [think of it?]

R: In your answer, in which you came very close to mentioning the parallel between the politeia and the soul, , is the Crito per-haps abstracting from the politeia in the same breath as

S: That's a good point. R: And the difficulties of knowing just what is the law reach their extreme form when there is an argument over the regime

. The weakness of "Obey the laws" is--"That are the laws? What do the laws really command? And this is why the Socratic argument here won't work. And the extreme example of that breakdown is . Hence the Crito abstracts from .

S: Yes, to go back to your main point. That is reasonably stated, that the abstraction from the soul is in the last analysis identical with the abstraction from the politeia, the politeia being the soul of the polis. With that I can

. [The buzzing here became much louder, blocking out a question here.] But on the contrary, what you said would seem to prove...to confirm the older...say, the Platonic-Aristotelian view. What is legal and what is not depends, as a matter of principle, on the regime, because the laws depend on it. Therefore such things as wars of liberation, as the Communists call them, abetted by Moscow or China or both, have a different legal status according to the Communists than they have according to the Americans. So what is legal and not legal depends on primary political

. And that is of course also a legalism, especially [among?] international lawyers, who do not care for that and say simply there is sovereignty of states, principle of non-intervention , and a modern principle--since the 16th century on. The old view was that there is a kind of moral duty to intervene. For example if you are confronted with a barbaric tribe engaging in all kinds of , and especially against innocent , and there is of course a duty [to all humanity?] to change that state of affairs.

But still, incidentally, there is a beautiful presentation of that issue with the

necessary irony in Defoe's famous novel, Robinson Crusoe, where Crusoe considers the question May he interfere with the cannibalism of the natives there or not? You know? And he is a strictly...a modern thinker, recognizing the sovereignty of the states, he cannot interfere. But when the temptation is too great, because he sees that is about to be eaten, his good heart overcomes his rational principle

[laughter] So that...I think I would say the older view that the political considerations over-ride the legal considerations in the sense at least of the positive law made sense. Now the question of course is then there are all kinds of very many sub-questions. For instance, is it not better to have any law, however bad, rather than completely arbitrary government? And then one can very well say that law as such, however bad and unjust acts as some kind of a limitation on arbitrary power. You know? You must not forget that quite a few things--some of the worst things which the Nazis did--they did not even on the basis of their own legislation.

but by simple arbitrary whim and extra-legal influence on the judge. These are long questions. But the main point is I think still intelligible and clear, that law is the work of the legislator or legislative body. And who is the legislator or legislative body depends on the regime. Is it a democracy? Then it will be in one way or the other the people at large or their representatives in a non-sense. Or if it is not democratic then it will be the rich, the men of a certain religion, or of a certain race or whatever that may be. Surely not democratic. And this is decisive for the spirit of the laws in that community.

[Another insubstantial question here, but the buzzing stopped after it.] That is a question. That is one of these questions which are inevitable and to which there is only--since it is a very general question--there is only a very general answer possible. That depends. [laughter] I.e., it is a matter of judgment. Well look at such a situation as Russia, Soviet Russia. It took quite some time until people who loathed this kind of regime felt it is here to stay and you have to be "realistic." The same discussions we have now as you know regarding China. That depends on judgement, and here of course expediency plays a very great role. Let us assume, for example, that by some strange combination of circumstances the more radical Communist regime--say, Mao--would become seriously embroiled with the Soviet Union and would need the help of the United States, and would therefore be willing to make quite a few concessions. This very wicked regime, the most wicked of all, would appear in a different light than it did before. Never forget that the most Catholic king, Louis XIV, was a very good ally of the Turkish Sultan against the most Christian house of Hapsburg. These things are inevitable. And this is a matter of expediency where one cannot make any rule, any general rule.

Q: Well my problem is that when Socrates disobeyed the Thirty tyrants he did so on the basis of legality. S: Yes. Which was of course, naturally, the democratic legality in the first place. Q: Yes, but if the regime had been improved instead of...S: In other words...Q: If it had been a better regime and if he preferred it, then because of his judgement of what is just I think he would have gone along immediately with all of their commands. S: Yes. That is to say, if they had been truly virtuous and just, Socrates would not have been prevented by any legality to the democratic legality from adhering to them. Surely. But then a simple criterion would be they would not have used Socrates or any other respectable citizen as a potential hangman. That would be a practical criterion for Socrates. You see? I think we also would accept that, that we would not be used for such dirty work as a sign that the government is bearable. Yes?

Fielding: If the best politeia does not exist in fact, if there is fundamentally not a concern for the soul and knowledge at the root of actually existing regimes, is not the abstraction from all these things in the Crito not an accident?

S: That was too long a sentence for me. I had once a student who, when I made a long sentence, said "Please split it into two." And I had to give him first the first half and then when he had said, "Yes, now go on to the second half," and then he'd put the two together. You must do the same to me.

Fielding: Well it would seem that there's grounds to believe that the best politeia, that is, the one that is concerned with the soul, dedicated to the soul ... S: To virtue. F: To virtue, does not exist as a political regime. S: All right, in the strict sense, yes. All right. F: And then it would seem that the abstraction from all these things in this particular dialogue, the Crito, is not an accident, that is, insofar as the dialogue seems to be oriented toward this world and what actually occurs. It would have to abstract.

S: Well, let me put it this way. Since this dialogue is based entirely on the question of the established democracy, the question of the goodness of the democracy and its laws doesn't arise. But you will see very soon that this is not quite true, and therefore let's wait. Pardon? Now we go on. And I'll make first this general statement. The issue has been settled. Why does Socrates go on? Has he gone too far in demanding unqualified passive and active obedience to whatever the fatherland commands? In other words has he gone too far in regarding the citizen as simply the slave of the laws? One point has been neglected entirely since 50c 4-6. Namely, the need for agreement or covenant between Socrates and the laws, especially regarding accepting the judicial decisions of the city, there is no covenant between father and son or between master and slave, although later men -- for instance, Hobbes -- tried to put all relations on a consensual, contractual basis. In other words Socrates has to remedy the effect of the argument regarding the goodness of the Athenian laws. You remember he stated that the Athenian laws regarding marriage and elementary education are good. And starting from that he jumped at the conclusion that one must be absolutely subservient to all Athenian law. This is a very bad jump, so he must remedy this defect. And this he will do in the sequel. Now let us begin, Mr. Reinken.

R: "Observe then, Socrates," perhaps the laws would say,...For we brought you into the world,..."

S: No, "We generated you," quite clearly.

R: "...generated you,..."

S: They are male.

R: Ah. "We begat you, nurtured you,...all the good things we could..."

S: No, not "all the good things," "of the noble things." "And we gave a share of noble things to..."

R: "...to you and all the citizens." S: "If which we are able."

R: "...of all the noble things we could do to you and all the citizens."

S: So the laws gave to Socrates what they gave to every other Athenian citizen as well, i.e., they gave to Socrates no more and no less than what they gave to the many. They gave him only such noble things as they were able to give to everyone. That is already an indication of the limitation of the laws. Yes?

R: "Yet we proclaim, by having offered...and go away wherever he likes."

S: So. Now we come to an entirely different point. The laws claim now that they treat the citizens not as slaves or serfs or children but as free men. And therefore, they imply that unqualified submission without freedom of submission or not submission lacks binding force. In other words what Socrates...the thought which he suggests is fundamentally the same as that which has become so famous, especially through Rousseau's Social Contract. You are not bound except on the basis of previous consent of yourself. This is a great supplement. The laws may not be good, but if you have agreed to them then you are obliged to obey. Now we must not forget, however, the...I cannot possibly even allude to the history of the notion of the social contract. Let us take only the most famous example, that of Rousseau. What is the difference between Rousseau's concept of the social contract and Socrates' whole position? The starting point of Rousseau, as everybody knows, is the natural equality of all men, or so it seems. And Socrates questions that. Socrates starts from the premise of inequality. We will see later on whether this is of any importance. Now men are subject to their parents and their masters without a covenant. I mean how could a newly born child make a covenant that he will obey his parents provided they bring him up, or so? All obligation, political obligation--that is the point--must rest on consent. Let us see what follows from that. Yes?

R: "And none of us stands in the way...where he will live as an alien."

S: You see...Now apparently he merely repeats what he has said just before. But to mention only the most important change, the laws add now to the laws the city. Now and this means...forces us to raise this question: May one not like a city without liking all its laws? There is a reference in 5--"And none of us laws"--a reference to the plurality of the laws. Some laws may be good and others may not be good. Yes?

R: "But we say that whoever of you...to do what we command;..."

S: "By deed," "by deed." R: "By his deed." S: So remaining in Athens beyond one's infancy, so to speak, amounts to a tacit agreement, a tacit contract, to do everything what the laws command. This consideration supersedes now the argument taken from one's being the slave or child of the fatherland or of the law. But we must see whether this is literally true, this suggestion. Yes?

R: "...and we say that he who does not obey...and do not roughly order him..."

S: Now wait a moment. Socrates you see tries to keep both heterogeneous considerations, the consideration taken from the master character of the laws, the parent character, and from the agreement character. He slightly blurs the heterogeneity by speaking of three reasons for unqualified obedience to the law. And why

this? Now here the laws make a distinction between themselves as generators and as educators, or upbringers. This leads to the question, Does the mere generating of a child without bringing him up, and in particular bringing him up properly, give a man the right to be obeyed by the child? You know that is a difficult question and if you want to have it spelled out in all details, you should read the second treatise of Locke, chapter 8, Of Paternal Power, where this question is discussed, to what is the authority of the parent, say in the case of gross neglect, can he still demand rightly to be honored by his offspring or not? Incidentally also the question, Why should a slave be bound to obey his master? That is of course a still more obvious question. Yes? Re-read the last part. And in the third point he had agreed to obey...

R: "...after agreeing to obey us he neither obeys us nor convinces us that we are wrong..."

S: "...neither persuades us if we do something not nobly." Yes?

R: "...nor persuades us if we do something ignoble...he does neither of these things."

S: Now we have the argument which shows us the character of this whole thing. The Athenian laws are mild, reasonably sweet, sweetly reasonable. And this is the ground why they are binding. Contrary to what was said, especially in 50c 7 ff., about, you know, that you have to...must not hit back and must not insult when you are insulted and this kind of thing. If you...They are very nice. They give you the opportunity to persuade them. But if you fail to persuade them then the sweet reasonableness stops, of course. If you cannot persuade the laws that what they prescribe is bad or base, they naturally cease to be sweet and reasonable. And the laws point out to Socrates that he never tried to persuade the Athenians of the unreasonableness of any Athenian law. Now we have an example in the Apology, 37a 7 - b 1, where Socrates speaks of the Athenian law regarding capital punishment, that they...What is the precise point? R: That these trials shouldn't be settled in one day only. S: Yes, so that there is proper consideration because of the seriousness of the charge. So Socrates says this would be better if this were done not in one day but that people could sleep over it. But why did Socrates never try to persuade the sweet, reasonable laws of Athens to correct what was not so good in them? Why?

Schaeffer: He says in the Apology that if he had tried he wouldn't have lasted very long.

S: Yes, well if we want to be quite orthodox we would have first to say that his daimonion prevented him. But then we would...Because political--and the daimonion was reasonable--because political activity would have led to his premature death. In other words there was no possibility of persuading the Athenian laws. The Athenian laws were tyrannical, at least as far as Socrates was concerned. They would never listen to him. Yes?

R: Aren't the laws boasting a little, as far as Crito would be concerned? They say, "Any of you can go away wherever he likes." They don't quite say "when-ever you like." But all Crito has asked is that Socrates exercise his option to take his goods and go.

S: But the trouble... But now he has been condemned. R: So this is a limitation on the of the laws, that they... S: No. They would have permitted him to go away prior to the trial. [R's response inaudible] S: No, prior to the trial. But once the trial... once he was condemned then he had to be executed. We'll come to that; he takes up that. It's no objection. Yes, but the more important point is the contradiction between the Apology and the Crito regarding the possibility of persuasion, which is a major argument meant to prove that the laws of Athens are morally binding as you would say, because they give every citizen the opportunity to persuade them. And we see that is by no means the case. Yes!

R: "We say that you, Socrates,... any other journey, as other people do,..."

S: Right a moment. "Except once to the [Isthmus?], to [Isthmus of?]
Corinth." He went once there. All right.

R: "...as other people do,... showing that it pleased you."

S: Yes, let us stop here. So Socrates now turns this state of things, the fact that the city's mildness and sweet reasonableness can be questioned to the advantage not of himself but of the laws. He admits that his case is unique. Socrates' whole conduct shows that he was singularly pleased with the city of Athens, and hence with all her laws. Now his conduct surely proves that he liked to live in Athens; there is no doubt about that. But does it prove that he liked the Athenian laws? After all there is more to a city than its laws. More precisely that he regarded the Athenian laws as good? There is a discussion of this subject, although not in these words, in a very well known place, in the 8th book of Plato's Republic, where Socrates discusses the five regimes. He makes there a distinction between five regimes in descending order. [Goes to blackboard] Now the order is this:

Aristocracy- that is the rule dedicated to virtue. And that in the Republic means of course the rule of the philosopher kings plus absolute communism. And then we have, how does he call it here? R: Timocracy. S: Timocracy, thank you. Timocracy, i.e., where virtue is replaced by honor, which is a lower principle but still respectable. Then oligarchy, which is the rule of wealth. In other words no concern with virtue or honor, only with wealth- but still respectable because these stingy, avaricious fellows exercise some self control regarding their sensual desires because they love to amass money. And then we come to democracy- and democracy is complete license, freedom is . And finally tyranny. And tyranny is of course unqualified injustice.

Now the point is that this is a simply descending order and it is made very clear. But some reference in this discussion to another famous arrangement, not of regimes but of races of men, namely, in Hesiod's Works and Days there are five races. [Goes to blackboard.] The first is of course the golden. And then comes the silver age- descending as you see. And then bronze. And then the heroes. And then iron, the iron age. So in other words in Hesiod you have on the whole a descending order but a strange interruption of the descent in the fourth place. And there are all kinds of explanations for that possible. I have no explanation. But [laughter] Plato uses it, and Plato gives it a sense of its own in the application to the descending order of the regimes. Democracy alone makes an exception to the descent. Why? Because democracy, with its notorious license of everything,

bad and good, permits philosophy. Whereas philosophers are permitted only in the aristocracy strictly understood, the rule of the philosophers, naturally--they are the rulers, they will be permitted. And they are out of the question in timocracy, which is Sparta, which makes very much sense. And also among the people concerned only with wealth. And of course also impossible under tyranny according to this pious teaching here. But they are permitted, as everyone knows, in democracy. Socrates himself, after all, lived and flourished in a democracy. And therefore this has of course a great bearing. So Socrates could live and do what he liked in the highest sense of the word under a democracy, which he could not have done say, in Sparta. In Sparta he probably would have been exposed as an infant, because they would have smelled to begin with that he was not exactly what the Spartan order desired. Now where is this point? Yes, in the 8th book of the Republic. Yes. Now, one point which I forgot. If for reasons which I cannot now specify--takes too long--one can show that the best regime of the Republic, i.e., the philosopher-kings, is impossible, let us assume that for one moment, then the only regime in which philosophy is possible would be democracy. Which of course makes great sense historically speaking because it was in democratic Athens above all where classical philosophy flourished. And therefore one can say the only regime that is possible in which there can be philosophy is democracy, a rather defective regime because it is in no way concerned with self-restraint--that is true up to the present day--and therefore of incredible mildness, especially in its penal law. There is a long description in the Republic, 558 a-b, that in a democracy you may be condemned to death or exile, and just walk around as if nothing has happened. Now it is of course unfortunately not universally true, and especially not in the case of Socrates. But we do not know whether, if Socrates had tried to flee from prison, some Athenian authorities would not have minded; that we do not know. Good. to just mention that.

R: Wouldn't it be a simpler proof on the matter, you don't have to prove the impossibility of the aristocracy, but the Republic rests on compelling the philosophers to stop philosophizing. S: For long periods, yes. R: Democracy has more philosophy than the best regime because philosophers are allowed to walk around in the streets and do what they like. S: That's true. R: But the best regime rests on denying philosophizing. S: Still but if we look at it realistically, [laughter] we must consider there is some difficulty. You know, for example, there must be some visible or invisible means of support. Now if one is wealthy, as Plato was, of course then he knows he can live on his wealth. But then he must also administer his wealth. This can be quite time-consuming. Say you rant your land, and the fallows are not usually dependable. You have to go after them. Takes time. You have to go before law courts, perhaps. Or if you are poor, of ten-thousand fold poverty as Socrates says he has, then you have also to do something to live. At least Socrates had to take care of the many private problems of his friend Crito. You remember the story when he had to find an anti-sycophant to keep the sycophants away and some other things. So the question is whether these duties of public administration imposed on the philosophers in Plato's best regime are greater--I suppose they are eventually greater hardships, than the private dependencies. Yes, I will admit that. Good. Now where were we now? In 52 c 3. Is this the point?

R: Yes. "And moreover even at your trial...as you said, death or exile."

S: Now let us stop here. By trying to escape now, Socrates would contradict

not only his deed, namely, his tacit agreement, speechless agreement, but his own logos on the occasion of the trial where he had the opportunity to prefer exile, and they might gladly have exiled him. Yes.

R: "And now you are not ashamed to think of those...We must, Socrates."

S: Yes. Now Socrates returns now to the injustice which he would do to the laws by breaking his covenant with them. And this is now the only reason why Socrates is obliged to stay in prison. The only reason is that covenant. The previous consideration that he is the child of the laws is now completely dropped. Yes. And as you see when you look...Everything is now settled, that Socrates must stay in prison, and it's settled on both grounds--on the ground of the absolute submission like a child or slave, and on grounds of the tacit compact. So each of the arguments is defective, but the defects of one are remedied by the virtues of the other. And the question is whether the mutual correction of the two kinds of arguments makes the whole argument a sound one. That is the question. Whether something entirely different consideration does not have to be introduced. And as a matter of fact I think we should not read on because the time is short. Socrates will introduce an entirely different consideration, so that the two heterogeneous arguments he has used hitherto form one argument, in contradistinction to the argument he will introduce very soon now. The first argument consisted...The two arguments form one argument in so far as they are both based on consideration of what is just, and just defined either in the sense of a patriarchalism, or of contractualism. That is a subdivision. And then beginning from 53b on, Socrates will argue no longer on the basis of the just but on the basis of the good. In other words on the basis of expediency. So we will see then there is...This distinction implies that the previous simple equation of the good with the just is not valid, otherwise we couldn't make the distinction. But one could come to the assistance of Socrates in this point, and this would last for quite some time although I believe it wouldn't last til the end of the day, by saying that the argument from justice is based on the identification of the just and the legal. Now that the good should be identical with the legal simply, no man in his senses would say. Because there may be bad laws. Therefore, be this as it may, Socrates is compelled to go beyond what he calls here considerations of justice and introduce considerations of expediency, why he should not escape from prison. And we must consider that argument and we must also consider the whole argument then, whether and to what extent it is demonstrative. Now there is one point has to be considered, and we will take it up at the end of this discussion. Deeds are more trustworthy than speeches. The deed of Socrates is that he did not run away but stayed in jail; therefore he chose to stay there, he had a reason for staying there, a logos. So there was a logos of Socrates in favor of staying in jail and undergoing capital punishment. This logos of Socrates is not necessarily identical with the logos which he presents to Crito. Or perhaps we should say Socrates' serious logos is only a part of that extensive logos which he presents to Crito. And we would have to see which part of that whole logos is serious and which it is not. And then we would have to raise the question of course if there should be a non-serious part why Socrates goes to the troubles of having such a non-serious part. Yes?

Q: Well, I was just wondering, Socrates seems to imply that it isn't really tacit consent. Just living in the state is enough to prove to the state that he likes it. But what about a man like Thoreau, who lived in the state but yet, you know, whenever there was an unjust law or something that he felt went against his

own will he just refused to obey it. But yet he used the state in every other action. S: Yes. Q: So isn't that sort of like really simplifying things, to ...

S: Yes. I think so. And Socrates alludes to that I think quite clearly by making the inference that if you stay in a land, in a country, and you have the opportunity to go to another country, then one can presume that you like it, that you like to stay where you live--for God knows what reason, perhaps simple attachment to the country or attachment to your family, whatever it may be. But the conclusion from attachment to the country to attachment, i.e., high regard for, the laws of the country is not valid. That's true. And Socrates will make it I think clear beyond a shadow of a doubt that the argument is not conclusive in what follows when he discusses the alternatives which he has if he would consider running away. But that I must postpone.

So. Let us come to order. If everything goes well we shall finish our study of the Crito today and have then two more meetings for...free for the discussion of Xenophon's critique of the charge against Socrates. Now we are now studying Socrates' reply to Crito. I remind you of the main points. First Socrates had said that only the opinion of the knowers or experts, as distinguished from the many, must be considered. And this applies especially to the opinions of the knowers or experts regarding the good, the noble, and the just things, if there are such knowers. Now this crucial "if" indicates the difficulty, and therefore Socrates has to turn to another way of argument in the second point where he disregards the question as to whether there are such knowers. And here he states one must not do injustice to anyone, and hence in particular not do injustice to someone who has done injustice to oneself in the first place. And doing injustice is identified with doing harm to human beings. After having made this point Socrates personifies the laws, he makes them persons. And he asserts that the laws assert that Socrates would commit injustice against the laws if he were to try to run away. And here we see already...we saw at once the difficulty: Are the laws, personified or not, human beings? And if they are not human beings how can you do injustices by doing harm to the laws?

Now the specific points which Socrates makes the laws make are these: The laws generated Socrates and brought him up. He is more subject to the laws than a child to his father or a slave to his master. He must suffer and do whatever the laws command. Then a second argument. A very important kind of doing injustice is breaking a just agreement with someone with whom you have made such an agreement. In trying to escape from prison Socrates will break his tacit agreement with the laws, which was to the effect that he will suffer and do whatever the laws command. So the conclusion is the same in both cases--he must suffer and do whatever the laws command. This incongruity of the two arguments, the one taken from Socrates being a child or a slave, and the other Socrates having made an agreement with the laws. There is no reference to an agreement, compact, covenant, or however you call it, in the first argument--unless one were to construe the relation between master and slave or that between father and child as a contractual relation. Which that was done later on, most visibly in Hobbes, but before him to some extent by Althusius, a writer of the early 17th century.

Now why does Socrates juxtapose these two heterogeneous arguments, the one taken from a non-contractual relation, and the other from a contractual relation? Well the non-contractual, the obligation deriving from non-contractual relation is questionable because it might well appear to be tyrannic that you should be compelled to suffer and do whatever the laws command without having given your agreement. And from this point of view the argument taken from agreement, covenant, or compact, seems to be more reasonable, more humane. But the question is of course whether it is sufficient. Did Socrates in fact make such a tacit pact with the laws? Did the fact that Socrates liked to live in Athens prove that he approved of all her laws? We know from the Apology, from a contemporary work, that he did not like all the laws of Athens, for example, the law regarding capital trials. Furthermore, another important implication from the argument taken from contractual relation is that the laws or the city are very nice because they permit you to persuade the city or the laws to change the laws and so give you a fair deal. But the question is, would Socrates ever have succeeded in persuading the laws? And the plausible answer is, No. And the simple reason being that he would never try to persuade the city, and the reason was as we know, his daimonion. He knew that

he would not survive for very long on entry into the political scene. Now this much we have discussed last time, and we will continue at 52c 3. But before we read I would like to ask Mr. Bruell, he has a question or an objection. Yes?

Bruell: Well the question is, What is...well, first of all, is the problem of whether there is an expert or not related to or perhaps answered by Socrates characterizing his knowledge as knowledge of ignorance? And in the second place, what is the relation of this problem as to whether there's an expert or not or whether Socrates' knowledge is knowledge of ignorance to the justice of his staying in jail and also the question of the justice of his condemnation?

S: Now let us proceed step by step. You admit, I take it, that knowledge of ignorance is not ignorance. Bruell: Yes. S: So by knowing that he does not know, Socrates knows, for example, what the most important things are, or what the most important questions are, although he does not necessarily have an adequate answer to them. Is that [it]? Bruell: Yes. S: Good. Now and in this there is implied, I take it, that he knows what is the good life, which is something quite positive, namely, that the good life is the life of investigation, examination, or however we call it--the philosophic life. Would you admit that this is reasonable to presuppose? Bruell: Yes. S: Good. Now but let us then assume that it is not possible to devote one's life to investigation if one lives by oneself in a desert. Would you admit that? So in other words, some form of political life seems to be necessary. After all in a state of complete anarchy, constant turmoil, and so on, it's hard to concentrate, to say nothing of the fact that before Socrates could devote himself to the philosophic life he had to reach a certain age, and he did not yet know that the philosophic life was the best life when he was a baby. He needed some protection. And there is a certain kind of attachment growing from this protection which normal human beings have and which must not be disregarded. So in...So since the philosophic life presupposes a society of a sort there is a kind of obligation to the society which makes possible philosophy. Does it not make sense? The issue is discussed in Aristophanes' Clouds where Socrates is presented as altogether indifferent to the city and her fate. And there is one argument which is made there by a simple citizen--I believe it is old Strepsiades himself, who says...or is it the just logos? I do not remember at the moment. Who says the city feeds you. And you know, one good deed is worth another. So there is a kind of obligation arising from this dependence. Does this not make sense that if you owe the condition of what you regard as the best life to somebody else then you are obliged to that somebody else?

Bruell: Well one can owe the condition without being completely...in other words, the city is a necessary but not sufficient...

S: Yes, but to the extent to which it is necessary one must do everything one can to keep it alive. Especially since, after one has declared by deed one's unwillingness to exchange one's city for another. And this of course would mean you would only change your obligation from city A to city B. So this would still remain. So certain consequences regarding justice, it would seem, follow from the premise that the philosophic life is the good life.

Bruell: But then it would seem that the problem of the expert is not a problem at all, that one can know from...

S: Yes, I see. In other words that Socrates, who knows, or claims to know that the philosophic life is the best life, knows also that certain duties derive from that. But not, for example, the duty to engage into politics--that he made clear. And hence also not the duty to try to persuade the laws to change themselves or the polis. And...But the question is then of course what about this very particular case, namely, could Socrates justly escape from jail? That's your point. We do not have all the evidence yet. Because the arguments which I...the main points of which I repeated are only part of the argument; we'll still come to other ones.

Bruell: I still have one further question. I don't see the force of the doubt about whether or not there is an answer. I mean is that doubt something simply associated with this dialogue and unnecessary in this dialogue, or does it point to a more..

S: Well I think one can say that. And say this, that the...what happens in the Crito is that the problematic expert, I mean the expert regarding which it is a problem whether he exists or not, that the problematic expert is replaced by the laws. And the laws are taken as a kind of superhuman beings. What they are is not made clear. But a simple reflection would show that the laws of Athens are the work of the Athenian demos, i.e., they are opinions of the many. And so that contrary to what was said in argument number one--the opinions of the many are of no account--the opinions of the many now turned into laws are much more powerful and much more authoritative than the opinions of the expert. In other words the Crito indicates and evades at the same time the problematic character of the laws. But there is no difficulty here--I will speak of that later--because this is said in Greek, pros Critona, toward Crito, and therefore since Crito is pleased with it, why should we be not pleased that? Yes?

Bruell: At one point you said if there is not an expert then the laws have much greater weight. S: Yes. Bruell: And whether or not there is an expert seems to be left in doubt and therefore...S: Yes. If you forget about the experts the question of the laws ceases to be so great. You can also state it differently, in more traditional language, but language alluded to in the Crito, as we have seen. If there is no natural right, if all right is positive, then you cannot criticize any positive right--except on very secondary grounds that different positive laws contradict each other and therefore the judges wouldn't know what to do, and so on and so on, which is good as far as it goes. But a consistent, nasty positive law could not possibly be criticized. And you remember the passage where he said in Athens one could persuade the laws or the polis of what is by nature right, you remember that passage? That was an important reference. Yes. I think your question is connected, as I know...

Bolotin: I'll try to pursue the point. You talked about Socrates' obligation to the city, which was , and I grant that. If you obviously wouldn't deny that he has an obligation toward himself to lead the best way of life. S: Yes. Bolotin: Now in this case since Socrates is an old man there seems to be a harmony between his obligation to the city and his obligation to himself. S: Yes. Bolotin: I wonder what happens if he's a younger and his obligation to the city... S: Well that is everybody's guess. [response inaudible] [laughter] Pardon? Well that also depends on the...I would say that depends very much on the circumstances. But surely the argument taken from old age cannot be applied to a young

man. That is surely true. But if you take the young man and put, say, a Socrates of 25 is confronted with a choice between dying unreasonably and dedicating his life to philosophy, he would be in a different position than Socrates of 70. But then you would have to know the situation. For example let us assume Athens is at war at the time. And he would just burn his draft card, or something else. Then one would have to go into that. Is this a wise course of action? It depends a bit on the enemy, for example. If the enemy is an enemy of all culture and of philosophy the situation would be somewhat different than if he is a highly civilized enemy. That one would have to consider, and many other things. Yes?

Vitallo: On the point of Socrates' obligation to the city, in the Clouds Socrates is shown to be living from--aside from petty thievery--from gifts, and does the obligation... S: Occasionally petty thievery. [laughter] Vitallo: Can you speak of an obligation, that Socrates incurs an obligation, when he's specifically as receiving gifts? And I assume that in return he gives gifts of knowledge or ... S: Yes. Vitallo: Do you still see that...Isn't it... S: But if people feel grateful to Socrates for the nice things he told them about the of gnats, and other things, there is nothing wrong if the people show their gratitude by some gifts which keep his body and soul together. Or do you think there is something wrong? Unless there were a law against the receiving of gifts, which is not likely...which surely didn't exist in Athens. Vitallo: I thought there was some special character about gifts... S: But the point is that this book, the Crito, is written by Plato, not by Aristophanes. Plato never presented Socrates as doing such slight irregularities as engaging occasionally in petty theft. But Socrates is presented as a perfectly model of a man.

Bolotin: Excuse me for...but on the same point, you said that one of the considerations which would affect Socrates if as a younger man he had the same choice, was whether all philosophy was threatened. But there might be a conflict then, if all philosophy is threatened there might be a conflict between his obligation to himself as a philosopher and his obligation to philosophy. S: Might be. Bolotin: How would you decide that? S: Well that obviously depends, and you would have to elaborate the case. You cannot decide a case if you do not know all the relevant circumstances. But that there could be conflicts is undeniable. Socrates has stated it only in very general terms in the Apology, but not in the Crito. If this city were to make it a crime to philosophize he would not obey that law, whatever the penalty might be. But this is only an extreme case. Why don't we...Well, you ask--you. And then you will be the last one, because we must really try to finish the Crito.

Q: On the statement that if there's no natural right then we can't criticize positive right. S: Pardon? Q: You made a statement that if there is no natural right we can't criticize positive right. Then if there is this natural right and no one recognized it, does it really do us any good? S: No, that is a question... Q: Something else that bothers me, I mean if you assume there isn't a natural right are you saying you can't criticize any positive right whatsoever on any other grounds? S: Yes. Yes. On which ground would you do it? Well take a simple case. In the present day discussion of civil rights in this country, what's the basis of that? Does anyone--they don't speak of natural right, most of them, surely not. A: Utilitarian grounds. S: Pardon? A: They criticize on utilitarian grounds. S: Or still more...But what does utilitarian mean if this is not a disguised form of natural right? I believe they refer frequently to the

Supreme Court decisions. Did you hear that? Have you heard that? That means of course to positive law. Or even if one refers to the Declaration of Independence not as the signers of the Declaration meant it but as a kind of fundamental law of the land, even more fundamental than the Constitution, that is still positive law. You could not, say in Ceylon, argue on the basis of the Declaration of Independence, whereas you could argue in principle everywhere at any time on the basis of natural right, according to the meaning of natural right. And utilitarianism, the view that the greatest happiness of the greatest number is the standard of legislation, that's not a positive law standard. Does it not mean, in other words, it is intrinsically just to do whatever benefits the greatest number? A: It may mean better for the workings of the society if everyone were allowed to... S: What does "better" working of society mean? What does that mean? In its way the Nazi society also worked, and it worked in many ways better than a democratic society. What does working mean? It means working with a view to certain desired ends. And why are these desired ends preferable to other ends which also are desired by human beings? Answer: Because they are intrinsically just. Natural right. I think that is... merely blurs the issues. Well when Bentham's opposition to natural law was an opposition to a certain kind of natural law, and a very rigid understanding of natural law--you know, the ordinary understanding of Locke, property right, this is the natural right. And that is of course a very narrow understanding of natural right. But every criticism which is more than a criticism based on the law of the land must in fact refer to natural right. Whether it sees it or not is another matter. Yes.

Schaeffer: Concerning the first of Socrates' argument, does it necessarily undermine the argument from experts if there are no experts? Or does all one needs is the in principle possibility of experts? In order to criticize the... S: Well if... What do you mean by that? There might be experts but we don't know whether there are. Schaeffer: Well no. In other words if there are no experts but it's in principle possible that there can be an expert, meaning that we can have opinions about the rightness and wrongness of laws, but not knowledge. S: That opinion has no higher status... opinion A has no higher status than opinion non-A. Only knowledge can have claim a higher status than any opinion. Schaeffer: People will still claim that they have true opinion and others have false opinion. S: All of course people who have terrible opinions will always say that they are the true opinions. Ultimately you have to transcend opinion and come to knowledge. Even the Nazis admitted that. Why did they elaborate what they called their racial science? Science. Why did they do that? Because they felt somehow the superiority of knowledge to opinion. Schaeffer: You can't claim that one must do as an expert would do unless one can either claim to be or to know an expert. S: No, if... I mean the simple solution would be if there are experts. Then we defer to the experts just as we defer to them in the case of the well-being of our bodies. But if there are no experts, i.e., if there is no knowledge possible in that sphere, as is today the preferred view as you know, then what can you do, since there must be some--as most people feel now of the time--that there must be some rules of conduct? Because otherwise there would be constant conflict. And that means the law. And that there are people around at all times who either by deed or even by speech don't consider the laws does not do away with the great practical importance of laws. As you see from the fact that even the Syndicate is very much concerned with having what they call mouth-pieces, you know? Who before the law in terms of the law try to prove that these gangsters are law-abiding citizens. A strong proof of the power of law, even among some lawless people. Now let us first con-

plete our study of the Crito.

R: I think we've come almost to the end of 52d. S: But let us nevertheless
...R: But repeat from 52c 3. S: Yes. R: Middle page 183. S: "Furthermore."

R: "And moreover even at your trial...you preferred, as you said, death to exile."

S: So by trying to escape now, Socrates would contradict not only his deed, his tacit agreement with the city, but his own speech, which he made--namely, that exile is not a desirable thing. Yes?

R: "And now you are not ashamed to think of those words..."

S: "Speeches," "speeches."

R: "...speeches...We must, Socrates."

S: Now Socrates returns here to the injustice which he would do to the laws by breaking his covenant with them. The only reason why Socrates is obliged to stay in prison is that covenant. Because the other, that he contradicts his speech, and at that time he gave himself airs, that makes him ridiculous if he contradicts himself in this way, but this is not an obligation proper. Yes?

Q: Well, the example just brought up of the slave implies that the slave somehow had an agreement with his master, and if the slave ran away...

S: No, that he doesn't say that there is an agreement between the slave and the master. This is a rhetorical argument that he is doing something very lousy, what the louisiest slave would do--run away. A decent slave would not run away; that's the implication. Of course quite a few slaves ran away, especially during the Peloponnesian War, you know, and this was most deplorable from the point of view of the owner and also from the laws. But whether it was an impartial observer could have blamed the slave for running away, because the original trader was paid for the slave did not constitute an obligation of the slave. Because one could very well question, and people in Plato's and Socrates' time did question, whether slavery can be reconciled with any notion of justice.

Q: But then in that case, it says that you would be acting like the meanest slave, running away against your agreement and compact, against your compact, which sort of implies that Socrates...

S: No, but he doesn't...No, there is no. You do what the lowest slaves would do, they do, but there is no direct connection between the action of the slave and violation of compact on the part of the slave. By running away you violate a compact, you, Socrates, violate a compact. And therefore you do something very despicable. And you act as despicably as a low slave. But he does not link up the lowness of the action of the slave with his violation of the compact. Yes.

R: "Are you then," they would say,...if you thought the agreements were unfair?"

S: Now force and fraud, that is here implied, cannot bind anyone. That is very clearly stated at the beginning of Rousseau's Social Contract when he discusses the social contract as such. But the thought itself is of course much older than Rousseau and we have it here. The whole argument reminds...of the Crito reminds of Rousseau, but there is this fundamental difference. Rousseau's doctrine of the social contract is based on the natural equality of men. Now Socrates does not accept that, on the contrary he argues on the assumption of inequality. But this creates a difficulty because if men are by nature unequal, may not the one who is by nature superior use force or fraud against a man who is by nature inferior? For example, in the case of madmen is the most obvious point. This is the argument of the Republic. Here is another reference to Socrates' old age, as we have seen, and again the question, What if he were 40 or 30? Would this not materially affect the decision? Yes.

R: "But you preferred neither Lacedaemon...or of the foreign ones,..."

S: "The barbarian ones." R: "...the barbarian ones....a city apart from its laws?" S: "Without laws." R: "...a city without laws? And now will you not abide by your agreement?"

S: Let us stop here. Socrates is said to have praised Sparta and Crete as being...the Greek word eunomeisthai has a double meaning. First to possess good laws, and h) to practice these laws, to put them into effect. You know, to be law abiding in general. And also to possess good laws. You can also be law abiding if the laws are bad, obviously. Now did Socrates ever say of Athens that it eunomeisthai, that it possesses good laws and puts them into practice as Sparta or Crete did? Was not Socrates wholly uninterested in the laws as such? There are two passages in the Apology of which we must think here, 20e 8, ff. You know, the passage when he makes a distinction between Chaerephon, the comrade of the Athenian demos, and the comrade of Socrates. These are two very different considerations. And other passages. Here the defective character of the conclusion from liking a city to liking its laws becomes very clear in this remark. For the city of Athens pleased Socrates, but who would be pleased by a city without laws? That is true. There must be some order. But that doesn't mean that the laws of that particular city are pleasing to one. That a polis without any laws cannot be pleasing does not mean that the laws peculiar to a given city are pleasing. Here is a point where Burnet has something to say for our benefit. "These remarks here are intended to anticipate the objection that Socrates was induced to remain at Athens by some other attraction than its laws." There might have been plenty of attractions in Athens without its laws. Think of the many people, for example, today who like to spend some time in Paris without being attracted by the laws.

[laughter] Good. Now let us read the end of this passage.

R: "You will if you take our advice,...by going away from the city."

S: So to make oneself ridiculous, that has to do with reputation. Socrates owes it to his reputation to stay in prison, contrary to what Crito's main point. Now the issue is now settled on the ground of the compact or agreement between Socrates and the laws. And it is settled, as we see from 52d 7--Crito's answer there--the issue is settled to Crito's satisfaction. But Crito is not given now an opportunity to state his agreement, as you see. The...And this means that the

transition to a new argument, different from the one taken from the agreement between Socrates and the laws, is concealed. The new argument is prepared, however, as we shall see soon, by the reference to Sparta and Crete. Yes.

R: "For consider....to the risk of banishment and the loss..."

3- S: Now wait a moment. Now here the new argument begins, which goes on to the end of the work. The new argument concerns no longer justice but what is good for Socrates and for his friends. And the fact that he can make this distinction between the just and the good shows that the unqualified identification of the good and the just is not possible. And still less of course the unqualified identification of the good with the legal, and this identification of the good and the legal is after all the main point here. Yes?

just good

R: "...your friends also will be exposed...cr of their property."

S: We observed already in a way, it was not so visible as here, in commenting on 50a 6-7, when Socrates says, "If we," "we," plural, "we were to run away," meaning "I and you Crito." You remember? And I said Socrates seems to imply that if Socrates breaks that law Crito will be forced to go into exile, too. Here it is now stated explicitly. Yes?

London: As to the distinction between the just and the good, earlier Socrates had referred to the triad of the just, the good, and... S: And the noble. Yes. London: Are we to understand... S: They were identified at that time. London: They were identified. S: Yes. London: Are we to understand that good now is also doing duty for noble, or this might be yet another consideration? S: No good in the low sense. You know? Say, for Crito it would be a great misfortune if he would lose his property. Even if he loses it justly. Is this not the way in which we think most of the time? Or lose one's arm, to say nothing of one's life. Or what are the other? Or go into exile. Does this not make sense that these are bad things? Even if they are inflicted justly? What is punishment but inflicting some evil on someone who deserves it? But if what he gets were not an evil it wouldn't be a punishment. Think if someone does some evil action he were given a cruise to the Caribbean, one of these pleasant places there. No one would call this a punishment. An evil, that is necessarily implied when we speak of punishment. I do not understand your difficulty. London: Well, I'm sorry, I thought you had implied that inasmuch as the just had been identified narrowly with the legal, that to the extent that we were now leaving the consideration of the just we were moving on to a higher plane. S: No, that I didn't say, a different thing. London: I'm sorry. S: That needs a long investigation. But you are nevertheless right that it is meant to be a higher plane from Plato's point of view. There is a very simple proof of that. When Plato in the Republic speaks of the highest piece of learning, the highest subject of learning, how does he call that? The highest thing which we reach after we have understood everything else? London: The idea of the good. S: Idea of the good. Now he does not call it the idea of the just; on the contrary he says explicitly that it is higher than the idea of the just. Similarly in the Symposium, the fundamental desire of man is the desire for the good, not for the beautiful, according to the speech there. Not for the beautiful but for... Eros is desire not for the beautiful, as we would say off-hand, but the desire for generating in the beautiful or through the beautiful. And this generation serves the purpose of perpetuation of the species. And perpetuation

is a higher form of self preservation, a good--not something intrinsically noble or just, but the basis of everything noble and just. So there is no question that the good is according to Plato the highest consideration. But this is not stated here explicitly. Here it is only clear that it is a different consideration. London: Well to the extent that he had referred earlier to the trial of the good, just, and noble, I was just wondering... S: I know. Well that is... Yes, Socrates or Plato say both. They make this simple equation and they deny it. This means that we as readers or as pupils of Plato and Aristotle have to try to resolve that contradiction. Within a certain sphere they might be identical; but they are not simply identical. Good.

Now the point which we have here to consider...Incidentally, the word which is here used for friend is again epitadeioi, not philo. I mentioned this before. But the point is here very important for Crito to consider. That if Socrates goes into exile against the will of the laws, life will become unbearable in Athens for Crito and the others, too. Now would Crito consider going into exile, we do not know, but it is surely a question which is forced upon us. Yes?

R: "And you yourself, if you go to one...for both are well governed--..."

S: I.e., possess good laws or are law abiding. Yes?

R: "...will go as an enemy, Socrates,...regarded as a destroyer of young..."

S: Well that is...destroyer and corrupter is the same word in Greek, diaphthoros. "Who is a corrupter of the laws is a corrupter of the young."

R: "...might well be regarded as a corrupter of young and thoughtless men."

S: This qualification is interesting. "Young and thoughtless people" are in need of legal restraint to a higher degree than old people who are not thoughtless, because they have the law in themselves. Now there is a different argument in the Apology, 37c 4, ff., which we might read, where he also discusses the question of exile. Do you have it? 37c 4.

R: Bottom 131. "Shall I then propose exile as my penalty?...No, men of Athens, they certainly will not."

S: So in other words it is useless for Socrates to exchange Athens for another city because he would be confronted with the same problem in whichever city he might come. This is of course a very long question, because there were cities... because the mere fact that the cities are hostile to each other could work to the benefit of a fugitive from justice. Well the greatest case, of course, that of Alcibiades, you know, who was accused of very high crimes, impiety and so on, and was received with open arms, so to speak, in Sparta because Sparta was at war with Athens. And in our time we know very well that quite a few people who would be fugitives from justice--say, in Great Britain--would be received with open arms in, say, Czechoslovakia, and vice versa. So this...there was no difference in this respect between 1967 and 1999. Yes?

R: "Will you then avoid the well-governed cities and the most civilised

men?"

S: Namely these which you would find in Thebes and Megara. This is the point. Yes?

R: "And if you do this will your life...what kind of conversation, Socrates?" S: "Speeches." R: "...speeches...You cannot help thinking so."

S: You see again he calls these people in Megara and Thebes the most orderly, dignified of human beings. He didn't say that of the Athenians. "Yet it is not worth living except in cities which possess good laws and practice good laws, and with such men," namely, men of very great orderliness. Do we find such men and such laws in Athens? That's the question which is raised but not answered. Yes?

R: "Or you will keep away from these places...and changing your appearance."

S: Now wait here a moment. Now the alternative to going to such a wonderful city like Thebes and Megara would be to go--where of course a fugitive from justice is despised because of this very fact, you know, because they are so law-abiding. The alternative is to go to a lawless country, like Thessaly--that's almost like Dodge City in 1850. [laughter] A lawless city far away. But the question is...Here we have always to think, is this disjunction complete? A law-abiding city nearby, in Thebes and Megara, where everyone would know the gossip from Athens. And a lawless city or country, like Thessaly far away. Is this complete? Pardon? Fielding: There could be a law-abiding city far away. S: Far away. That is indeed true. Now what is an example of a law-abiding city far away? At the end of 52e, Socrates is presented as having spoken of Sparta and Crete. Now Sparta was not hospitable to strangers; that was not a good place to go. But Crete was different. So why not go to Crete instead of to Thessaly? There you have good old laws, properly practiced, and no one would know what Socrates had done in Athens. I believe this possibility, this theoretical possibility, is at the bottom of Plato's Laws, where not Socrates, but an Athenian stranger--and no one knows who that Athenian stranger is. Aristotle says it is Socrates, calls him Socrates, and Aristotle should know. [laughter] And one can say the most interesting point in the Laws is Book 10, in which new laws regarding impiety are established by that Athenian stranger who may well have been a fugitive from Athenian justice. Good. Now let us go on.

R: "But will no one say that you,...that you transgressed the highest laws?"

S: You see again the crucial importance of Socrates' old age, a point which is emphasized time and again. Again we raise the question, What if he had been 35? And notice here as elsewhere the matter of course, the reference, to what people say, which Socrates had declared to be a wholly unworthy consideration, when he speaks of what is good in the crude, massive sense as distinguished from what is right and wrong. He must do that. Now in the next sentences, where you left off.

R: "Perhaps not, if you do not offend anyone..."

S: But this "grieve," "offend," anyone, this is not the same as doing harm to anyone. Doing harm onto anyone can perhaps be avoided by a very good and conscientious man. But hurting people's feelings he cannot possibly avoid, because...

Why? Why can no man, however good and careful, how can no man avoid hurting people's feelings?

Wolfowitz: Is it to some extent related to the debunking of the Apology, that they're aware of his superior knowledge?

S: Oh, well he could conceal his knowledge by talking only about the weather. But because of the great power of vanity which man has. I mean that is impossible. Even if he makes himself as invisible as possible he could not figure out whether his being nice to A would not offend B, and so on and so on. So that is important. But this only in passing. Explaining, however, the use of this word here. Now someone else was trying to say something. R: Should I go on? S: Yes.

R: "...but if you do, Socrates,...what will become of our conversations..."

S: No, "speeches." R: "...speeches about justice and virtue?" S: Now in Thebes and Megara you will suffer the indignities of a fugitive from justice, because these are such stern, law-abiding people. In Thessaly you will be wine-dined, while of course you discredit the speeches which have given you that high reputation in Athens. That is the situation. Yes?

R: "But perhaps you wish to live...to the dwellings of the dead?" S: Well, to Hades. R: "If those who say they are your friends...in both cases alike."

S: Socrates speaks here in passing, as you see, of the exile as in itself a great evil. And the question of course would be, regarding the children, how to balance the great evil of exile against the advantage of being educated by such a father as Socrates. That would be the question of the good. We must also remember that at the end of the Apology, IIa, Socrates entrusts somehow the education of his sons not to his friends but to his condemners, this mysterious thing. Someone raised his hand. Oh yes.

Q: I have two questions. First of all, it wouldn't seem to me to be just two alternatives between Socrates educating his sons in Athens and educating them elsewhere, but even after Socrates' death would his sons still be able to live a good life in Athens? I mean so much public prejudice has been built up against Socrates.

S: That could be, that is true. But in fact...Socrates could not know it but he could divine that the Athenians might repent what they had done to him. But a simpler reason probably is that Socrates did not think too highly of his children so that they would need him as their educator. You know the argument which he uses against Pericles and Themistocles and the other great Athenian statesmen in the Meno and the Gorgias that they were not good statesmen because they did not educate their own sons properly, where the question is disregarded whether any statesmen or any man of virtue could have made anything great of this inadequate material. And there the question of course arises, naturally arises and Plato wants us to think of that, that Socrates' sons were as little distinguished and perhaps even less distinguished than the sons of Pericles, Thucydides, and the other statesmen mentioned there. Yes. Now let us go on. Let us first finish it. Yes?

R: "Ah, Socrates, be guided by us...to say in your own defence."

S: "To those who rule there." Now Socrates, you see, returns now to his original position. The only consideration is that of justice. What had to be said about the good is finished. But now the consideration of justice is connected with or supported by the belief in Hades. Burnet makes here also a point to which we do well to listen, 54b 5. "The [Orphic] doctrine of judgment after death is assumed here, as it may well be; with Crito there is no need for the reserve which was appropriate before the judges." That is a reference to the Apology where Socrates says, "Well perhaps death is only a state of dreamless sleep," in contradistinction to Hades. Well one could of course also give another reason, that Crito is more likely to believe the stories of Hades because Crito is old. That would at least be in agreement with what is said about Cephalos, old Cephalos, at the beginning of the Republic. Now what we must try to understand now is why Hades comes in here under the heading of justice, but after the consideration of the good. Let us go on; we will [find that].

R: "For clearly if you do this thing...and neither will it be better when you reach Hades."

S: You see here the three considerations are distinguished: the good, the just, and the holy. And at the end he speaks here only of the good. More precisely, for this life considerations of the good, the just, and the holy--the noble is now replaced by the holy, you can say--for the next life, only considerations of the good. For the good in the next life is the rationale--your well being after death is the rationale--for considering only the just, what is just, and especially what is legal, in this life. Because the prospect of a greatest good after death gives a crucial support to the consideration of justice, if justice is divorced from good in this life. Does this not make sense? Why should you act justly against your interest? Is it not a good answer to that, Well, you will be rewarded for that; you will get a much greater good than you have ever on earth, after death. This is at least a very famous argument. Yes?

R: "Now, however, you will go away...not by us, the laws, but by men..."

S: You see, the laws now confirm that Socrates was unjustly condemned to death, which is very important. I.e., he was not guilty as charged but he was condemned legally. And yet no one can blame the laws, because as we know the laws are super-human. They are, however, not said to be divine. That is very important. In...At the beginning of the Laws it is said, asserted by the Cretan and Spartan interlocutor of the Athenian stranger that the Cretan or Spartan laws are of divine origin, a claim never raised on behalf of the Athenian laws here. And later on in the first book in 63e, it is said that the Spartan and Cretan laws are of course good because they have been given by gods. Another argument wholly absent from the Crito. Yes?

R: "...but if you escape after...yourself, your friends, your city..."

S: "Fatherland." R: "...your fatherland and us---...but take our advice."

S: Now by escaping from prison, Socrates first breaks his covenant with the laws, and then harms himself, his friends, the fatherland, and the laws. Breaking his covenant, acting unjustly is one consideration; harming, inflicting harm, is another consideration. Yes?

R: "Be well assured, my dear friend, Crito,..." S: Now here he says, "my dear comrade, Crito," a combination which he had never used before. Yes?
 R: "...my dear comrade, Crito,...in this way that God leads us."

S: Now Socrates is now immune to any contradiction on the part of Crito. And he is made immune by what he seems to hear from the laws, in a kind of trance, i.e., not logos. And that is quite contradictory to h8d 8 - s 1, where he had said if Crito contradicts him he will do what Crito says. But this stage is now over. Now the end seems to say that the voice of the laws is the voice of the god. Whether this can be said to be written "God" with a capital 'G' and without the article, i.e., whether that can be understood in a strictly monotheistic sense, is a difficult question. Burnet is quite sure that it must have this meaning; it is wiser to suspend one's judgment regarding this point.

Now let us then first make some concluding remarks about the Crito as a whole. This is a deliberation between Socrates and Crito, and it leads to the conclusion that Socrates ought not to go away from prison. What are the reasons and how valid are they? The first are the reasons taken from justice. One ought to do whatever the laws command. Now this is clearly contradicted by the Apology of Socrates, where Socrates says he would not obey the laws if they were to forbid him to philosophize. And we may also say it is clearly contradicted by common sense. The second reason, which we read today, is taken from the good, what would be called a prudential or expedient consideration. In this context Socrates' old age is of the greatest importance. He does no longer have long to live--hce to eikos--I mean, according to all ordinary estimate. And, this raises of course the question why, since he cannot know it...there are all kinds of questions there. But the more obvious difficulty concerns the place of refuge. There is no proper place of refuge, as Socrates says. The law-abiding citizens detest a fugitive from justice. And the lawless cities are unworthy of Socrates, because he would be wined and dined but it would be unworthy of him. We have to consider furthermore the two-fold character of the argument taken from justice. First absolute submission, without covenant, and second submission only on the basis of covenant. This indicates a fundamental difficulty.

But what are we to think of the whole argument? Deeds are more trustworthy than speeches. Now the deed of Socrates is that he stayed in Athens. He chose to stay. He had a logos, a reason, for it. But is this logos, this reason which Socrates had for staying in Athens, identical with the whole logos presented in this dialogue? I suggest that these are two different logoi, the logos which persuaded Socrates and the whole logos presented in the Crito. But the two different logoi--Socrates' private logos and the logos presented in the Crito--lead to the same practical conclusion, that he will stay in Athens. One of them convinces Socrates; the other is made with a view to Crito--very different people. Crito is concerned with what the people in Athens will say--that is his chief concern. And Socrates appeases Crito, or gratifies him, by telling Crito what Crito should tell to the people of Athens if they say to him after Socrates' death, "You are a bad friend; you permitted your friend Socrates to die instead of helping him to run away." Now the fundamental defect of the argument is...consists in the personification of the laws. Which means that they are absolutized, irrational. But laws are the work of human beings, of the kind of human beings who are ruling in the city, of the regime. They are democratic in Athens, oligarchic in other places, monarchic in other places. The legislator in a democracy is the multitude.

And the multitude is frequently used in this dialogue in opposition to the knowers. This implies already Socrates' critique of the laws as *eunoi*. This critique is made quite explicit in Plato's dialogue, The Statesman, which is allegedly written much later. But that is of no concern to us. What is important is that this radical criticism of the laws as laws is made not by Socrates but by a stranger from Klea, southern Italy, who talks to a young man who happens to have the same name as Socrates, namely, the Younger Socrates. Plato did not go beyond that. What is behind it is this: Obedience to the laws is not an absolutely valid or sacred rule. But it is a wise rule of thumb. And to that extent Plato, or Socrates, are willing to recommend obedience to the laws unqualifiedly, especially when they talk to simplistic people. But we must raise the further question, Can we have anything better on the political plane than wise rules of thumb? Think of freedom of speech as frequently understood today as an absolutely valid rule, and this by many liberals who are relativistic and therefore contradict themselves very strikingly. It seems to me that what Plato, and in a different way Aristotle, suggests is that there are no absolutely valid rules of actions, because of the crucial importance of circumstances. And one can easily deceive oneself about it by the use of words the meaning of which is not quite clear. There are no absolutely valid rules of action, but there are absolutely valid standards of intrinsic superiority and inferiority. That is something very different. In other words, the truly good or the truly noble or the truly just is superior to its opposite. There are absolutely valid standards of intrinsic superiority and inferiority, but they are not absolutely valid rules of action, for the very simple reason that what is highest--say, the life of philosophy--is not always and cannot always be the most urgent. A simple example: an operation for an appendicitis is nothing to boast of. Perhaps for the doctor, but surely not for the patient. It is not a noble or just or grand thing to undergo such an operation. And yet it may be more urgent at a given time than anything else. So we frequently prefer and reasonably prefer the more urgent to the higher. But one cannot make a universal rule of that, because otherwise we would always prefer the urgent, or what seems to be urgent, to the highest and never find time for that.

The alternative to this view, which I believe was the Platonic/Aristotelian view, is natural law in the traditional understanding of that term. And here we have indeed absolutely valid rules of action. But the question is again whether they can be universally valid, whether they can be obligatory at all times and in all respects. A good example would be birth control as viewed by Aristotle and as viewed, say, by Thomas Aquinas. The Biblical tradition is of course rich in unqualifiedly valid, universally valid laws. Say, the prohibition against idolatry and apostasy and so on. But these are based on divine law, i.e., a kind of positive law, not a natural law. So this, I think, ... From this point of view the Crito becomes intelligible as stating in seemingly universal terms, One must obey and do whatever the law commands. And the very opposite view expressed in the Apology. I have spoken of that contradiction before. So I think that is of no use to begin now a discussion of Xenophon's Memorabilia. I will do that next time. So we can use the short time at our disposal for discussion. Yes.

Schaeffer: You were saying that one can't have universally valid rules of conduct... S: Of action. Schaeffer: But there are universally valid rules of what is superior and inferior. S: What is intrinsically superior and inferior. Schaeffer: It doesn't seem... I mean the distinction doesn't seem to be that sharp

between rules of action and rules of judgment. I mean one would have to say also that the rules for determining what's superior and inferior always have to be stated with a certain vagueness. S: Give an example. Schaeffer: Well, can one say that... If someone were trying to determine whether it was more noble to devote one's time to philosophy or to serving the city, it would certainly not be always superior thing for man to be philosophers, if the whole basis of life on which philosophy rests...

S: In other words for individual X in a given situation. Schaeffer: Let's say a man living in Nazi Germany who had the alternative of... S: Yes, but this doesn't in any way contradict. The example which you give is confirmed, so to speak, or taken from, say the end of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics, where Aristotle raises the question in universal form: Which is the higher form of life, the political life or the contemplative or philosophic life? And you know what his answer is--contemplative life is the higher. Now that does not mean that under certain circumstances it would not be good for a man to dedicate himself to his city; in no way. That is provided for by the distinction between the high and the urgent. But the intrinsic superiority of the contemplative life to the political life remains intact. I thought you meant somewhat more subtle questions, like that of the relation between philosophy and poetry as stated by Plato in the tenth book of the Republic or by Aristotle in the Poetics. You know, where Aristotle has roughly this scheme: Philosophy, poetry, history writing, and the history writing is the lowest. Now it is of course infinitely better to be a historian--say, like Thucydides--than to be a "philosopher" like some other people. [laughter] I mean that is clear. But nevertheless the intrinsic superiority of raising the fundamental questions in their universal character, universal form, and without any presentation in the form of a description of a given situation, political or other, this would still remain.

Schaeffer: But just because one has to distinguish, let's say, different levels of philosophy, there is no clear rule for saying, you know at what point is it better to be a historian than a philosopher.

S: Sure. That is easy. Then one makes the necessary subdivisions and then makes a more exact statement. It is perhaps not so easy, but in principle easy. Mr. Shulsky was first.

Shulsky: To go back to the first and unsubtle question that Mr. Schaeffer asked, there still would seem to be a certain urgency about the highest things, too. I mean in the case that he gave, for instance, if one was going... S: In the case of? Shulsky: The first example he gave. Should one spend one's time acting politically on the ground that that is more urgent, or engage in philosophy. There is a certain urgency about the philosophy, too, because there's only so many years... S: Sure. By all means. I mean nothing is easier than to postpone and postpone and postpone. Fully agreed. That is therefore one needs what they call judgment, which is not identical with a kind of geometric reasoning. That depends. You have to balance these things and sometimes you have to be even ruthless in postponing very urgent claims made upon you by yourself or others. Yes. Yes?

Fairbanks: At the very end of the Crito, in which Socrates compares himself to a dancer... S: Not himself, but the laws. But since the laws are

his creatures, you are right. Fairbanks: Nall, all right. At any rate it seems a sort of irrationality which you might not think befits a philosopher. Would you say something about that, what the meaning of that passage of the very and?

S: Yes. I mean I think that is a kind of admission of the irrational character of the argument. The argument has to be irrational because it is meant to convince a nice but not quite rational man. Namely, Crito. Fairbanks: But it doesn't. S: Socrates says, "Now I don't listen to you; and if you point out to me any defects in my argument I don't...I know very well these defects." Fairbanks: But that doesn't mean that Socrates actually is so affected; this is just for the benefit of Crito. S: Socrates, after all, had some rhetorical qualities, you know? That is quite true. And well there are some similar remarks in the dialogue called *Ion* about the effect produced by poets and the reciters of poetry, you know, which also produces a kind of trance in which you do no longer...are no longer able to discern and to distinguish. And now you are the last one.

Fielding: 53e, Socrates says that to flee to a law-abiding city would require him to live as an inferior and a slave to everyone. S: You mean in Thessaly. Fielding: No, no, in Thebes and Megara. S: Let me see. That is not in 53d. He speaks of... Fielding: 53e. S: e. That's still Thessaly. In Thessaly there he has...would be in a state of...he would be wine and dined but if he steps on anybody's toes he would be very badly treated. Fielding: Well that's a mistake on my part. But I believe you said that for Socrates to live as a fugitive in a law-abiding city would subject him to... S: That depends very much. If these people are sufficiently hostile to Athens, the fact that Athens was nasty to him would be a recommendation in the eyes of these people. I mean think of the glaring case of Alcibiades, who had been the greatest enemy of Sparta up to that point. And when his life was in danger and he turned, ran away from the command of the Athenian navy or army in Sicily to the Spartans, and the Spartans--well, they had never seen such a man before. And he had the nerve to tell them, "Yes, I was against you, because you were not nice to me. But now the Athenians are not nice to me and you are at war with Athens, so I join you." And the nerve, as they would call it now vulgarly, had a terrific impact, of course, because there is a kind of impudence which convinces because of its extremity. So one would have to take such cases also into consideration. That's the last question.

Q: Do you think that the comparison between Alcibiades and Socrates is really a good one? Alcibiades, when he went to Sparta, not only was impudent but provided real, military information. S: Sure. Sure. No, but still, we don't know. We would have to go into the question whether Socrates would not also have had some qualities useful to the people in Thebes and Megara. If you think that Socrates...the excellent advice he gave to Crito regarding protection against sycophants, you remember? And there could be...Socrates was a very clever man. And he could have been quite useful to people there.

Now here is a question. And that is the only question regarding the Apology and Crito I am able to answer at this time. "If Socrates says that he is wronged by man and not by the laws, how can he interpret his staying in Athens and submitting to execution as obedience to the laws?" Now I believe you should be in a position to answer that question. If the laws had wronged him then it is imaginable that one could say he does not have to submit to their wrong verdict. But he was not wronged by the laws but only by human beings, namely, by the men applying the law, by the judges. And therefore he has no right to complain about the law. Or is there more to that? Does this satisfy you?

R: a constant premise that the laws will not suffer you to be wronged if they can...

S: Yes, but how can they avoid that? By stepping down and transforming themselves into the appliers of the law. And this they cannot do. So in other words in a deeper sense of course the question remains. But still is it not...For example if someone is condemned to prison today for some crime, regardless which, and it was an error but an error not provable at the time because a mere assertion by the defendant that he did not steal a cow but someone else did is not sufficient if all the evidence available points to him. What can you do? This is a terrible deficiency of all human justice, but which cannot be remedied. To that extent the distinction between the law and the human judges makes sense, doesn't it? I mean the law prescribes that a man who has done such and such a thing will be punished in such and such a manner. It also prescribes that the punishers will be men appointed in this or elected in this and that way, the judges. This does not guarantee that the guilty...the men who are condemned will always be the guilty ones. This human error cannot be excluded. And the laws cannot be made responsible for the essential deficiencies of laws. There is a great difference between an unjust law, which therefore should be changed into a just one, and a just law which suffers from the deficiencies of everyone. Yes?

Q: But the laws themselves can be so constructed that they can take into account... and give the client a chance for appeal. Which could happen... S: Sure. That is true. That is however... Yes. All right. The Athenian laws suffered from that defect. But let us assume, as it is in this country; someone has been condemned to death. Let us take the extreme case. And be appeal all the way up, including the Supreme Court of the United States. And the Supreme Court finds no fault with the proceedings against him on the part of the lower courts. He then will be executed. Of course one can avoid...one can take care of this difficulty, and that is abolish capital punishment, the only kind of punishment which cannot be remedied if it was done...it was a wrong decision. That is true. But if a man is condemned, say, to three years in jail, and after the three years the true criminal will be discovered, the three years can't be given back to him, can they? So that deficiency remains in one way or the other and is an essential one. And that is therefore...I mean the laws have built in limitations, regarding which you cannot do anything. And this cannot be held against the laws. If you say we don't want to have the rule of laws but the rule of wise and just rulers, you know, the suggestion occurring in Plato and also elsewhere. But they, too, can be deceived. I mean a man may be very wise and yet be fooled regarding facts by very clever criminals. And nothing can be done about

thet. All right.

Now we completed last time our present discussion of the Apology and Laws [apparently a slip]. By present discussion I do not mean that I will ever be able to give another course of this kind. With a view to my mortality, I will hesitate to make such an implied promise. But you cannot, even if you have been able to understand everything you read or what I said in commenting on the text, there ... quite a few questions remain. Today there was a student with me and pointed out to me two points which I did not discuss in class and which were important to consider. One would have to have...one would have to devote much more time than six or eight weeks in order to give a fully adequate interpretation, even of these apparently simple Platonic works.

Now I thought I should devote the last two meetings of this course to a discussion of Xenophon's treatment of the charge against Socrates. Plato's treatment is not so simple and lucid in every point that we should not be interested in an alternative interpretation of what happened to Socrates, and regarding the question, Was Socrates guilty or innocent? Which is not the same question as, Was he a good guy or a bad guy? I hope you permit me to make this distinction. Now while it would be useful, and to some extent we shall do that, to make an as it were point by point comparison with Plato's defense of Socrates...of Plato's defense of Socrates with Xenophon's defense of Socrates, it is also necessary to consider from the very beginning...take into account the difference between Plato and Xenophon altogether, between the *troupe*-manner, the character, style--of Plato and of Xenophon. Today the manner of Xenophon, of Xenophon as a whole, is not greatly appreciated. In fact there exists today a very powerful prejudice against Xenophon. This prejudice stems from the 19th century, generally speaking. There is one striking exception in the 19th century, and that was the English translator of Xenophon, Dakyns, D-a-k-y-n-s. And Dakyns was a kind...understood Xenophon in the light of a British public school boy, which is quite charming, as far as it goes, and Dakyns has an enthusiasm for this kind of man. Which is also quite charming. But it won't do. Now in the 18th century Xenophon was still regarded very highly as one of the great writers. I mention one example. Winckelmann, in a way the discoverer of classical art, said...compared Xenophon on the one hand and Thucydides on the other to Raphael on the one hand and to Michelangelo on the other. And now Winckelmann thought more highly of Raphael than of Michelangelo. And you see what a compliment that is. Today if someone would dare to compare Xenophon to a painter like Raphael he would be regarded as utterly ridiculous. Now Winckelmann was of course guided in this judgment by a general notion of what is classical, and in particular classical art. And he used the formula, which has become quite famous, what characterizes classical art is noble simplicity and quiet grandeur. Now whether this is a true conception of classical art, and in particular whether that is a true ideal of art, has become absolutely questionable today. Who would dare to speak up today for noble simplicity and quiet grandeur? Yet although this ideal has been questioned in various ways on various grounds, the reputation of men like Thucydides and Plato, to say nothing of Sophocles and Aeschylus and Homer has survived. I mean there is still...there are quite a few people who today in spite of the questioning of the classical ideal as Winckelmann understood it, who still admire Thucydides, Homer, and the other men mentioned. But the reputation of Xenophon did not survive; it remained by the wayside.

From this we draw the conclusion that Xenophon is particularly alien to the

tastes of the 19th and 20th century. The question of course is, Is the taste of the 19th and 20th century--and say, especially of our generation now--better, more discriminating, than the taste of people like Winckelmann, and Shaftesbury, and others. Is the preference for noble simplicity and quiet grandeur inferior to other preferences? Does it not have a certain narrowness which we, with our openness to the opposite of noble simplicity and quiet grandeur, seem to have? This means that one cannot take up the question of Xenophon's rank, this very limited, uninteresting historical question, without questioning the preferences now prevailing, which is, as one would say, a philosophic question. Now what is undeniable, if we approach the evidence as unprejudiced as we can, what is undeniable is that Xenophon lacks the gravity of Thucydides and of Plato, to say nothing of the tragic poets. But of course the question is, Is lack of gravity identical with being a light-weight, with being a kind of colonel, retired colonel, who has a good understanding of horses and dogs and such things, but this is about all? Aristophanes, too, lacks gravity, and Aristophanes' reputation did not suffer as Xenophon's suffered. Yet one will say, look at the immense imagination, however ill employed, of Aristophanes. An imagination not inferior to that of Thucydides and even of Plato. What, then, is the peculiarity of Xenophon, a peculiarity so attractive say, to Winckelmann and the 18th century generally, and so repulsive to our age? One can say a peculiar charis, peculiar charm, a charm different from the charm of Plato, Thucydides, and so on.

Now I will try to give you an...Xenophon has said something [about that?]. In one of his works, called the Anabasis, The Way Up, which he made with the brother of the Persian king, Cyrus, who tried to dispossess his royal brother, and Xenophon was in this army and in a way saved the Greeks after a disastrous defeat. Now Xenophon gives here a speech which is very interesting in itself, toward the end of the fifth book. And at the very end of the speech he says, "It is nobles as well as just and pious and more pleasant to remember the good things rather than the bad ones." That is a very characteristic utterance of Xenophon and in a way a key to his whole writing. The formulation comes out more clearly in the Greek because in Greek all four adjectives used and on the same syllables, on--kalon, te kai dikalon, kai hosion, kai hae dian [ep?]. So that the fact that one is a comparative and the others appositives is not so noticeable as it is in that translation. And he implies, of course, that it is pleasant to remember bad things as well, as we all know. To remember dangers through which we have come after we have overcome them is pleasant. But the main point is that it is nobles, as well as just and pious to remember the good things rather than the bad ones. That means in effect to conceal the bad things, when you write about them, to play them down. Which is not possible unless you know them as such, otherwise how can you conceal them? Xenophon's manner is subdued, in no way loud. He avoids the depths or the heights of tragedy and comedy. He avoids also the Platonic flights to super-heavenly places. And needless to say he avoids the powerful analytical statements of Aristotle. Xenophon does not avoid the appearance of the pedestrian or prosaic. And that is what people today seem to see alone, the pedestrian or prosaic. Yet he is not pedestrian or prosaic.

One of the ancient gossip writers, whose notions have come down to us, has said about Xenophon that one of his character traits was that he was bashful. We have no means of knowing whether Xenophon, as he lived in the flesh, was bashful or not. But it is...I am inclined to believe that this was originally a remark of

a literary critic about Xenophon's way of writing and was then applied to the man. There is a wonderful example in English literature of something similar, and that is--and you must forgive me for saying so--that is Jane Austen. I'll read to you a passage from the last chapter, beginning of the last chapter of Mansfield Park. "Let other pens dwell on guilt and misery; I quit such odious subjects as soon as I can, impatient to restore everybody not greatly in fault themselves to tolerable comfort, and to have done with all the rest." Xenophon has something in common with Jane Austen. Now to illustrate this from Xenophon himself, this remark, that it's noble and good and just and pious and more pleasant to remember the good things rather than the bad ones, I quote to you a passage from the same Anabasis, Book two, chapter 6, at the end, a passage to which I referred in the last course on Plato's Meno -- Xenophon's description of Meno. Meno was a terrible character, unbelievably bad. And he had betrayed the Greeks to the Persian king. And now... Especially the Greek generals, of course. Now what happened to the Greek generals after they had been betrayed was that the Persian king had them decapitated. Because after all they came into his land as adventurers with his rebellious brother, Cyrus. And now when he speaks of Meno, after having shown what a low and abominable fellow Meno was, Xenophon says about him: "Now while his fellow army leaders, who had crusaded against the Persian king together with Cyrus, Mago, who had done the same, did not day, was not killed but died, not like the others by decapitation, which is thought to be the quickest death," i.e., the most preferable form of death, "but, having lived immured," buried beneath the earth, "is said to have come to such a terrible and only after a year's time." So you see that is a nice story, that a traitor, such an abominable character, is punished by the man benefiting from his treacherous act worse than ordinary traitors. It would be wonderful if this were true. But therefore Xenophon, in his wisdom, "That is said to have been the end of Meno:" he doesn't say that Meno actually... On the contrary Meno lived, as we know from other sources, lived... was of course greatly honored by the Persian king to whom he had done such a great favor, and lived happily forever after, unfortunately. But the nice version, the pleasant, the just, the good, the pious version is the one which Xenophon transmits. Yes? [Inaudible question] You cannot completely avoid it. Even Jane Austen cannot help speaking of--how is this called--the [Lady De Burke?]--what was the name of her nephew, this pastor? Who gets the fortune of the family. Don't you remember? Well I don't know. Well it's impossible to write about human beings without speaking of all kinds of vices and vicious people. But how you treat them, for example, whether they are successful or failures, that is the question. And the nice writers are those who show how wicked people get what they deserve. Is this not so? And if they perish, as they must sometime, that they are nevertheless more noble characters than the others. I mean Fortinbras succeeds; Hamlet fails. And yet Hamlet is not only the more interesting of the two men, he is also the more noble character. That is made clear. So in other words what you suggest would be to write simple fairy tales, especially of small children. Even there you must bring in some witch or some other terrible thing in order to make it quite interesting; otherwise it would be completely saltless. So we must not take this too literally. Good.

Now I will give you another example. I spoke of Thucydides, among other men, for the very simple reason that one cannot help comparing Xenophon to Thucydides because Xenophon wrote a continuation of Thucydides' history. There are all kinds of gossip about it, that Thucydides' daughter prevailed on Xenophon to finish that; no one knows whether that is true. But at any rate he wrote such a continuation. Because Xenophon led up only to which year was that? About 408, 407.

I forgot now the exact year. And the war lasted until 404. And then quite a few things happened after the Peloponnesian war. Xenophon wrote that and gave it the title Hellenica, which is ordinarily translated Greek History, and more literally, Things Greek. Now this book... Oh yes, thank you very much [to Keinksu]. This book begins as follows: "After that, not many days after, came from Athens with a few boats." The first word of this work is "after that," meta tauta [?]. I believe... I'm sure that the only book ever written which begins with the word "thereafter." There is a story of a preacher who began his sermon with "But." [laughter] It's much easier to understand and much less paradoxical than to begin a book, because you would naturally have to say "but" to the conduct of quite a few of his parishioners. But to begin a book with "thereafter" seems very strange. Now of course people have an answer. They say, "Well of course, it is a continuation of Thucydides, and why should he not write 'thereafter'?" But the trouble is that the first few pages of this book overlap with the last few pages of Thucydides, so that doesn't quite work out. But we also have to look at the end of this same Greek History, and this is a description of the battle of 362. And there Xenophon speaks first of the expectations people had from that battle. There was a terrific confusion, the Greek world then being divided chiefly between Sparta and Thebes. And people expected a condition of orderliness, of absence of confusion, in one way or the other after the battle. Now what does Xenophon say? "The confusion after the battle was still greater than before in Greece. But let me leave it at having written up to this point. What is thereafter may be the subject of somebody else." One can say the book begins and ends with "thereafter." Grammatically it cannot end with "thereafter," obviously, but the very word "thereafter" occurs in the last sentence. And here is a suggestion, conveyed by these two things--the very beginning and the very end, which can be stated as follows: What we call history is a sequence of events or situations--then, thereafter, thereafter, thereafter, thereafter. But at which situation you might look--and they are very different--one thing they all have in common: confusion. You can call this a philosophy of history. Which may not be... which is not exhaustive, but which contains one very important truth neglected by much more famous philosophers of history, namely, that there is always confusion. At the end of Henry VI, I... it must be, everything is fine; the house of York, the legitimate house, has won, and the house of Lancaster has been defeated. And unfortunately I forgot the verses, but everyone that now there is peace and order forever and ever. There is only one little thing, and that is the presence of the later Richard III. There is always such a little thing there, [laughter] the root of future disorder. Well I remember the enthusiasm on VE and VJ day in 1945. Many of you will be too young to remember that was also the feeling--now, after the Nazis, the Axis has been destroyed and this fundamental agreement between the United States, Chiang kai-shek [laughter] and Stalin, what else can there be? Well I think already at that time some people saw that little seeds of confusion, but today even the meannest capacity reading only any of the daily papers, however hopeful its persuasion may be, will know that. Good. That was another example of Xenophon.

Now as for Xenophon's deliberate avoidance of heights, I will give you an example from his Recollections of Socrates, the Memorabilia. In the third book of that work Xenophon speaks of how Socrates helped those who were desirous for the noble things--noble and beautiful is in Greek the same--and that means of course in the first place, for honor. And then he begins with some people whom Socrates

helped in this respect without even mentioning their names--nobodies. But then he gradually ascends, mentions names, and it appears when you read that that these were not very impressive. One is, for example, the son of Pericles--not the famous Pericles, but the son, who is induced by Socrates to agree with a severe criticism of the policy of his father. That would be as if someone tried today to make the son of Roosevelt agree to the defects of Yalta and other things. And then we come in Chapter 6 to an individual whom we all, or most of us, would know--namely, Glaucon, the son of Ariston, and that is the hero of Plato's Republic. "Now Glaucon the son of Ariston tried to address the people, the assembly in Athens. He was desirous to be a ruler of the city, while he was not yet 20 years old. None of his relatives and friends could stop him, and so he was dragged from the rostrum and made himself ridiculous. But Socrates, who was benevolent to him for the sake of Charmides, the son of Glaucon," the hero of Plato's dialogue Charmides, "and for the sake of Plato, Socrates alone stopped him." Good. And this story of Glaucon here in Memorabilia three - 6 is a very helpful introduction for the understanding of Plato's Republic; I mention it only in passing. Now the next chapter... Glaucon is higher than these people before, but Socrates was not benevolent to Glaucon for Glaucon's sake but for the sake of Charmides the son of Glaucon and for the sake of Plato. Chapter 7 deals therefore with Charmides, a conversation between Socrates and Charmides, obviously an ascent. Now we naturally expect that Chapter 8 will deal with the other men who is so great that Xenophon does not even give his father's name, his petronym, it's simply Plato. Whereas in the case of Charmides he had given the father's name. And then we turn to Chapter 8 and then we see who is spoken to in Chapter 8, an individual called Aristippus, who has one thing in common with Plato: he is also a philosopher and in every history of philosophy you will find his mentioned. What Xenophon does is this: [goes to black-board] In the third book he ascends from very insignificant people who are not even mentioned by name up to Charmides, quite a fellow--I mean he proved to be a very vicious character but he was a very gifted fellow. And then we would naturally expect him to come here, to Plato. No. He stops. Goes over to Aristippus, who is a kind of substitute for Plato, a very low substitute. And then he goes down. Afterward he gives the conversation of Socrates with a beautiful woman--after all striving for beautiful women is also a striving for beautiful things, isn't it? [laughter]--Good. And so on. And then at the end there are again very short stories, six lines long roughly, where Socrates speaks also with nameless people about good conduct at dinner, and so on and so on. Good. Now this is a characteristically Xenophontic procedure, to draw attention to something higher but refusing to discuss this. Perhaps because he thought he could not discuss it properly. Now who in his senses would dare to write a dialogue between Socrates and Plato? Even the young Plato. Good.

Now we find something similar in the fourth book. In the fourth book of the Memorabilia, which is quite separate from the preceding three books,... Oh, you have it. R: Yes. S: Why don't you begin to read it.

R: Page 265. [Loeb edition, E.C. Marchant, translator] "Socrates was so useful in all circumstances and in all ways,...in any place and in any circumstances."

S: You see how simple that all is. I mean you understand that, that some people are repelled by this way of writing. Good. Go on.

R: "The very recollection of him in absence...to his constant..."

S: No, "Even remembering him while he was not present was helpful...was not a little helpful to those who were accustomed to be together with him and accepting lessons from him." Yes?

R: "...for even in his light moods..." S: No, "even in joking, no less than in being serious, he helped those who spent their time with him." Yes?

R: "Thus he would often say he was 'in love';..." S: "With someone."

R: "...but clearly his heart was set not on those who were fair to outward view,..." S: On, God? No. "Who were beautiful regard the bodies in regard to youthful bloom." R: "...in body, but on those whose souls excelled in goodness. These excellent beings..." S: No, no, "Good natures." "The good natures," namely, those who are well built by nature for virtue, whatever virtue may mean. "Now those good natures he recognised from the fact that they learned quickly whatever they applied their mind to, and remembered what they had learned, and desired all pieces of learning through which one can well administer one's household and the city." Yes?

R: "For education would make such natures not only happy...His method of approach was varied." S: No. "But he did not approach all in the same manner." Yes? R: "To those who thought themselves possessed of natural endowments..." S: No, "Those who believed to be good by nature but despised to learn,..." R: "...he explained that the greater the natural gifts,...if they are broken in as colts,..."

S: And so on. Now later on he speaks of how he...Read the beginning of paragraph 5 only

R: "To those who prided themselves on riches...he admonished thus." S: And so on. He approached them all differently. Beginning of chapter two. R: "I will now show his method of dealing with those...and prided themselves on wisdom." S: Good. So in other words he approached different people differently. And now he gives examples in the bulk of Book IV only of the last type, namely of those who believed having acquired the best education and thought highly of their own wisdom, i.e., fools. And the example is an individual called Euthydemus. And he deals with this individual Euthydemus and in addition, in the central chapter there--chapter 4--with Hippias, the most foolish of the sophists. He doesn't give a single example of how Socrates dealt with those who possessed good natures. That's another...the same thing...example of the same thing I mentioned before. Let us take another example--I, 6...Book I, chapter 6, paragraph 14. A conversation between Socrates and the sophist Antiphon.

R: Page 73, bottom. "That is my own view, Antiphon...they will get some moral benefit." S: "They will be benefitted with a view to virtue." Yes? R: "And the treasures that the wise man of old...we extract it,..." S: "We select it." R: "...and we set much store on being useful to one another." S: No. "...and we regard it as a great gain if we become friends to one another." Yes? R: "For my part, when I heard these words fall from his lips,..." S: "Fall from his lips" is of course a sentimental addition which is utterly despicable? Yes? R: "...I judged him to be a blessed man himself...in the way of

being gentlemen."

S: Good. Now "blessed;" this great word is applied by Xenophon to Socrates I believe only here. It was the highest praise. And the example which he gives here is that they are reading together the treasures which the wise men of old have left behind, and when they find there something worthwhile they take it, they accept it. And . . . There is not a single example given by Xenophon of this practice of Socrates for the sake of which he called him blessed. Xenophon avoids all the heights and depths, but knows them and points to them.

Let us take another example, just to get a provisional notion of Xenophon's way of writing. In the first book again, chapter 3, in which...which is the only conversation between Socrates and Xenophon recorded by Xenophon in his Socratic writings. Now Xenophon had given a kiss to the handsome son of Crito, Critobulus, and Socrates sternly warns him against such things. Now let us see. Let us begin paragraph 11.

R: Page 51. "Poor fellow!" S: Stronger. "You miserable..." R: "Wretch." S: "Wretch." [laughter] R: "...wretch! What do you think will happen to you...And do you think, you foolish fellow,..." S: "You fool." R: "...that the fair inject nothing when they kiss,...anyone who only looks at it?"

S: Now that is sufficient here. But at any rate the only character ever called by Xenophon's Socrates a fool and a wretch is Xenophon himself. Aristophanes' Socrates, who is a very boorish fellow in his conduct, [vereees?] this all the time, naturally. But Xenophon's Socrates, who is as urbane as Plato's Socrates, uses these harsh expressions only to Xenophon. These are simple examples which are meant to show that the simplistic understanding of Xenophon now prevailing is based on an amazing lack of sense.

Now I will mention a few more points before we turn to our immediate subject. The most striking difference between Plato and Xenophon--and of course we will think of Plato more than anybody else because of the connection of the two men with Socrates--is that Xenophon did not write Socratic dialogues proper. An exception will be mentioned later on. Xenophon did write a dialogue, but not a Socratic dialogue. And that is a work called Hiero, or On Tyranny. Now I..The subject is tyranny. And the point which is made first --the dialogue between the tyrant, Hiero, of Syracuse, and the poet Simonides, a poet mentioned in the third book of the Republic especially and in Plato's Protagoras. And Simonides had visited Hiero and a dialogue develops. And first of all, in the first part--in the larger part--Simonides induces by some very simple tricks the old tyrant Hiero to say the worst things possible against tyrannical rule. What a terrible life a tyrant has. Just what every nice man would wish to be always true, because then there wouldn't be any tyrants. [It would be?] as simple as that. And then after having led up to the point where the tyrant says a tyrant can do nothing better than to cut his throat, Simonides the poet begins to comfort him, and shows him what a wonderful life a tyrant could lead and how much he could be liked by his subjects, provided he would only go about it in the right way and become a benefactor of his subjects rather than their oppressor. It is in a way a fairy tale story but it is much more than that because the premise that the tyrant had come to

power by hook and by crook and has ruled originally by hook and by crook is never questioned. Only by a change of policy, which he starts when he has secured his throne, he can become a benefactor of his subjects and his pre-history, his criminal pre-history is completely forgotten. That is very roughly the story of that dialogue Hiero. Here neither Socrates nor Xenophon appear; that happened far away in Sicily and not in Athens and so. It is a very hot iron, and therefore this treatment. Now this dialogue Hiero was greatly admired and used by such amazing individuals as Machiavelli. As a matter of fact Machiavelli refers more powerfully to Xenophon than he ever does to Plato or Aristotle. This side of Xenophon is today completely forgotten. I have mentioned it more than once in print, but the prejudice of the 20th century is so strong against Xenophon and what he stands for that I think no one except some students, former students of mine have been willing to consider this seriously. Good. There are other strange features of Xenophon's writings which could induce one to wonder whether the present day interpretation of Xenophon is sound. The present day interpretation can be reduced to the simple formula that Xenophon was rather nice but rather foolish retired colonel, and had this limited horizon. And one of them—a famous man, Burnet, whom we used in this course, by the way—Burnet ventured to suggest that Xenophon had practically no knowledge of... of course not the slightest understanding of Socrates, but that he had also practically no knowledge of him and that he was attracted to... by Socrates on the ground of Socrates' military reputation alone. Now. That was one of those things... Well when a prejudice has become very, very powerful then people are bound to be very stupid. The originators of the prejudice must be clever men, because they caused... they created the prejudice. But the followers, however learned and Burnet was a very learned man, become simply unreasonable, unintelligent. Now he suggested that Xenophon was attracted to Socrates only because of Socrates' military reputation. And Xenophon doesn't say a word about Socrates' military reputation. That is only in Plato, partly said by Alcibiades at the end of The Banquet—Alcibiades was very drunk at that time—and Xenophon doesn't say a word about this. Xenophon says only Socrates was very just, which may also mean law abiding, both in peace and on military campaign. That's all. I mean if Xenophon had been that simplistic colonel, he would have written much more about Socrates' military feats than Plato has done.

I would like to say a few more words, which should induce people to reconsider the ruling prejudice against Xenophon. This prejudice stems from roughly 1800. I have not been able to trace it completely to its originators, but after 1800 it starts. In the 18th century Xenophon still had a very good press. For example... Now one thing which should make one think is this: The titles. When he describes the expedition against the Persian king, in which he participated and which made him so famous, so-called Anabasis which means The Way Up, namely, from the coast to the interior of Asia Minor. Now this, the Anabasis, The Way Up, is only the subject of the first two books. The chief content is the way down from the interior to the coast, the way down in which Xenophon was the leader. Or there is another book called The Education of Cyrus, a book of which Machiavelli thought highly and Machiavelli I think is as good a judge of what is a politically interesting book as the present day - 19th century classical scholars. [laughter] That is The Education of Cyrus. The military writers, I understand, still think highly of him. The famous English military writer, I forgot his name... R: Liddell Hart. S: Liddell Hart. Has spoken very highly of it I was told. Well Gustavus Adolphus was a great admirer but he also knew something of the military art. The Education

of Cyrus. The education of Cyrus is discussed in Book I, and it has eight books. The other books deal with what Cyrus did with his education, which is also the somewhat [sounds like "same shape."]. Even his most famous writing, the Memorabilia, doesn't tell you anything what it is about; that these are all recollections of Socrates is not said. It would have been easy to call it Recollections of Socrates, but he calls it just Recollection. What he means, I believe, is this: His recollections par excellence, his memoirs par excellence, were not his feats in Asia Minor when he saved the Greeks from the Persians and brought them back safely to the coast, but his recollections par excellence is what he remembered of Socrates.

Now if one would survey Xenophon's work as a whole (and everything has been preserved) and the situation today is that there is only one of his writings, called The Constitution of Athens which is regarded as spurious--all others are now again admitted to be genuine. And this Constitution of Athens I am by no means certain; despite the fact that everyone apart from myself regards it as spurious, that it is spurious. But that leads us far and we don't have to go there. At any rate his work as a whole has obviously foci. The one is Cyrus, and it doesn't make any difference whether you say the older Cyrus, the founder of the Persian empire, 5th century, or the younger Cyrus, a contemporary of Xenophon who rebelled against his brother and tried to deprive him of his throne, because Xenophon himself uses the two Cyruses as exchangeable, and so why should we be more exact than Xenophon thought wise to be? So one can say, then, roughly that Xenophon's work has two foci. One is Cyrus, the political man, and the other is Socrates. And one can easily group all the other writings around these two works. The Socratic writings strictly speaking are four. These are the Memorabilia,... How shall one translate it? Memories is not... The Things Worth Remembering. And the Economicus, The Banquet, and Apology of Socrates. Xenophon, just as Plato, wrote only one book with Socrates in the title, and in both cases it is an apology of Socrates. The Recollections or Memories have sometimes been called--even in editions of the original--Recollections of Socrates. But this is an arbitrary addition on the part of the editors. Xenophon used it only, just as Plato, in the title Apology of Socrates.

Now the relation of these Socratic writings, which are of course most important to us here because of the connection with Plato, we may perhaps take up a little bit later. I think we should perhaps turn first to Xenophon's explicit treatment of the accusation of Socrates in the first two chapters of the Memorabilia. All right, let us make a brief pause anyway and see whether there are any questions which you would like to bring up. Yes?

Q: In discussing Xenophon's method of leaving the high points out... S: Yes.
Q: That assumes that we have some other sources to find out what the high points are. [And if there were only his account?] then there would be no high points at all. Does Xenophon presuppose that we all know Socrates, say, one or two generations hence, or are there some particular writings which Xenophon expects us to use to find the high points?

S: No. That would be a very... How shall I say? That would not be art to presuppose something which cannot be presupposed as a matter of course, you know? I mean it can be presupposed... Say every writer at every time presumes that

there are human beings, sexes, good ones and bad ones, all kinds of professions... you know? And heaven above, earth below, and quite a few other things. He doesn't have to state that. But otherwise the relevant things he would somehow state or present. You doubt that? Do you doubt that? A: No, I... S: I mean a perfect work of art should convey its message without extrinsic means. Does this make sense? Except such, we go without saying, that if it is a writing one must be able to read, or if it is a song transmitted only orally that one has ears to hear, and so on. Disregarding these things as trivial, it should be self-contained. That I think was the older view. And therefore... Now what was your question again? I wish to answer it; it was a very good question.

Q: What I was wondering about is how Xenophon can assume that we'll find the high point. He's pointing to that, but if they're not available to us from other sources, how...

S: That is a good question regarding this particular point, Plato. If we do not know Plato independently of Xenophon we couldn't see that Plato is missing, so to speak, that this peak is... That is quite true. That is a very special case. But otherwise Xenophon has given us all the things needed in order to judge. For instance, when he speaks of Socrates' virtues he gives a list of them. And it is our business to see whether there is anything missing. He has given us lists of other people, of the virtues of other people, say of King , and Sparta, and Cyrus, and so on. Then we compare these lists of virtues and then we see what... which virtue, if any, is absent in the case of Socrates. And then we have to think about it. Now then we will find the strange fact that the virtue of manliness, courage, however you call it, is missing in the two enumerations of Socrates' virtues occurring in the works of Xenophon. But it is a fact; it's very strange. And especially if you think that Xenophon is a military man of sorts, particularly strange. But this is a problem which must be solved. The solution... I mean the simple solution that Socrates lacked andreia, is in no way imposed, of course, but it may very well throw some light on what people ordinarily understand by andreia, manliness, that Xenophon does not ascribe it to Socrates. Would it not? This would be an example. So in other words Xenophon himself gives us the evidence we need. Now there is another point. The Greek History is obviously, and that was very clear to the contemporaries and clear throughout the time when Greek literature was known, it is obviously in a sense a continuation of Thucydides' history. Therefore a man who is not competent to judge Xenophon's history and not competent to understand it fully if he does not know Thucydides. Does it not make sense? To that extent there are pointers there which give you intrinsic criteria for seeing what is missing. I'll give you a very simple and I think also a very charming example. In the Anabasis--you know that was the campaign led by Xenophon... No, no, in which Xenophon participated, by the Persian king's brother Cyrus against the Persian king Artaxerxes. When was it, about 403, 402 or thereabouts. Now then Xenophon describes it with a formula which former generations knew by heart and to the end of their lives, "From there they marched there " and so on and so forth. "From there they marched there." And now and then they say... Xenophon says they came to a large and rich, wealthy city. Then a bit later he tells you they came to a city, without adding any adjectives. Now what Xenophon says by the omission of the adjectives is that it was neither rich nor big. You know that is the subdued way in which he uses the adjectives of praise very freely and avoids the adjectives of dispraise. You have to get into the flow of this kind of writing in order to see what is not said is yet clearly pointed to.

So you are, I mean you are protected against arbitrary reading by this very fact. As it were, he establishes some way a framework, and you have to keep this framework in mind and see what is present or absent in a given situation. Does this make sense? Now the main point is, naturally, to study carefully. There are passages ... Xenophon... There are passages which seem to be childish compared to the sophisticated conversations in Plato. But when you read more carefully and have an understanding of Xenophon's bent, which has become an art, then you will not make this misleading comparison with Plato. Xenophon is called in the manuscripts, or in many manuscripts, the orator Xenophon. By that title he was known traditionally. That is helpful for understanding him. He is not a philosopher in the sense in which Plato and Aristotle and some lesser men were philosophers, but he is an orator of a high order, a mediator between the philosopher and the non-philosopher. That would be a better formula. Yes?

Q: Does that explain why Plato and Aristotle seem to mention Xenophon infrequently, if at all?

S: Well, you only have to read Aristotle's Athenian Constitution, and you will see how much he used Xenophon's Greek History. That Xenophon is never mentioned, as far as I know, in Aristotle doesn't mean much. And Plato of course... whom does Plato mention? I mean that doesn't mean what it means today. He mentions very low, inferior figures from the entourage of Socrates. Xenophon mentions Plato only once, and in this very passage to which I referred. And that is a very high compliment, that he says Socrates was favorably disposed or benevolent to Glaucon for the sake of Charmides, the son of Glaucon, and for the sake of Plato, without even adding Plato's father's name, patronym. That's all. But that is a terrific compliment if you see the context, that this is in a way a peak toward which the work of Xenophon is [driving? arriving?], and this is too great to discuss. Whether Xenophon is not underlying one of the Platonic characters in the dialogues is a long question. I have a certain suspicion, but since I have no means of proving it I will not state it. I believe that Xenophon occurs somewhere but I cannot prove it. As an unidentified character in the Philebus. I mean and an important character there. But it's of no use to speculate. And quite apart from the fact, does Plato ever mention Thucydides or Herodotus? No. The tragic... the poets he mentions.

London: In the beginning of the Farmenides there's a reference to Antiphon. I can't remember, either [remainder inaudible]

S: Which Antiphon is that? London: Well I'm not sure, but he's taking care of his horses and he pretends not... S: No, he is... No, but he has turned away from philosophy to the art of horse training and horse riding. That would also need some interpretation, how literally is this meant. I do not know. London: You don't think that's a possible reference to... S: No, no, I don't see... No. No. Good.

And I think we should now perhaps turn then to Xenophon's explicit treatment of the charge against Socrates, which we find above all in the first two chapters of the Memorabilia. Well I will try to translate at least the first sentence. "Many times I fell to wondering by what speeches in the world the accusers of Socrates persuaded the Athenians that he deserved death at the hand of the city.

For the charge against him was about this," not quoting literally. And then he says, "Socrates commits an unjust act by not believing the gods which the city believes but importing other demonic things that are new or novel. He also commits an unjust act by corrupting the young." Now this is...If we did not have the original of the charge we would be unable to say why this is not literally the charge. But the charge has come down to us literally in Diogenes Laertius, a late writer, and from that we see that the only difference, it is absolutely...the only difference is that in the charge it is said, hetera de kaina daimonia eisagoumenos, leading in, bringing in other divinities which are new. And Xenophon replaces that by epiepheron. And I tried to bring out the difference by translating that by "importing." It is a somewhat coarser expression. So but you see how strict he is. This little change, and therefore he says it was "about to this effect" the charge, not literally. Yes. Now will you go on?

R: "First then, that he rejected the gods..." "...that he did not believe the gods..." S: The word "believe" is of course...the Greek word is nomizein, which does not have the strict meaning of a credo in the Christian tradition, or [a Greek word?], but which means something like "holding to be true," or you can even omit the "to be true." "Holding." R: "...that he did not hold to the gods...and made no secret of it,..." S: Well, "For he was obviously sacrificed frequently at home, frequently also on the common altar of the city. And he was not unobvious in using mantike...divination." Now what did you want to say?

Q: It just seems that this translation is closer to how you rendered it [remainder inaudible]. S: All right, give it to me. This seems to be more literal, the student says. Who made that? R: Anna S. Benjamin, Professor of classics, Rutgers. S: Well because Marchant does not translate well enough, that is quite true. R: We had quite a fuss with Marchant last time. S: Oh I see. Good. That was the reason why. Now let us see. Let us see how Xenophon proves that Socrates was innocent. He sacrificed frequently at home, where of course only some people could see him. But he also sacrificed frequently on the common altars of the city. And he was not unobvious in using divination. Yes?

R: "Indeed it had become notorious that Socrates claimed to be guided by the demonic thing." S: By this famous daimonion. And hence that would prove that he believes in the gods of the city only with the help of some interpretation. Yes? R: "...I think it was out of this claim that the charge of bringing in strange daimonies..." S: Demonic things, daimonia. So in other words the reference to the daimonion wouldn't help. Because the daimonion was itself something strange and would therefore confirm the accusation. Yes? R: "Yet Socrates was not introducing ew demonies any more than all the others...this is what Socrates believed too." [Here Reinken is reading from the Benjamin translation, published by The Library of Liberal Arts, 1965.]

S: So in other words just as others use birds as sent by the gods Socrates used his daimonion, his demonic thing, as something giving him divine information. Yes.

R: "Most people say that they are diseased...he must have thought that gods exist."

S: You see the easy transition from god in the singular to gods in the plural. But I would, if I had to translate that into English, I would write god always with a small "g" in order not to suppose in Xenophon something like Biblical monotheism without any evidence. Yns. A god, in other words. "To whom would a man believe such things except to a god? And if he trusts gods, how can he help not believing in gods?" Obviously. Yem?

R: [Loeb edition] "Another way he had of dealing with intimates was this:..." S: The word is the same as we had in the Crito, epitidesioi. R: "...if there was no room for doubt, he advised them...whether the thing ought to be done." S: So in other words now he gives the rationale of Socrates' concern with divination. Because in some things the ordinary arts cannot know, and in a way that is the most important thing, to anticipate what Xenophon will say. Say, a carpenter can tell you how to make a good and stable and good-looking table. That is knowledge, human knowledge. But whether when you buy it you will not have some misfortune as a consequence of that buying, that goes obviously beyond the art of the carpenter. And how can you know that, whether it is wise to buy that table? The best carpenter in the world cannot tell you that. Only someone who would know the future. That means the gods. Yns.

R: "Those who intended to control a house or a city,...but the deepest secrets of these matters..." S: No, "the greatest things in these." R: "...the greatest things in these the gods reserved to themselves; they were dark to men." S: "The greatest things," he means the success. Even if you have mastered the strategic art and are a general like Napoleon I, that doesn't guarantee success, as is proven by some battles and his end. And the success, how can you guarantee the success? That needs a special art, going beyond that of the strategist, and that is the art of divination. Yns?

R: "You may plant a field well:...whether it is profitable to command:..." S: Command an army, namely. R: "...versed in statecraft, you know not...whether they will cause you to be driven from the city."

S: Is this not true? And don't you need therefore an art which makes you wise regarding the success? And what art would that be except the art of divination? Now there were oracles, therefore, all over Greece, and one could go to them. But one could also, if one was so lucky as Socrates was, have an oracle in himself, the daimonion, which told him what to do and what to avoid. This proves that Socrates believed in the gods of the city. Yes? [laughter]

R: "If any man thinks that these matters are wholly within the grasp of the human mind..." S: "Those who believe that nothing of these things is demonic," meaning, going beyond human understanding. But fella... R: Oh, I didn't catch that extra word. "That these matters...nothing of these is demonic, that men, he said, is demonic." S: Meaning here is [mad?]. R: "But it is no less demonic, mad, to seek the guidance of heaven in matters which men are permitted by the gods..." S: "Which the gods have given to men to know." For example, if you try to go to an oracle in order to find the solution of a mathematical problem, it is absurd because the gods have given that to man. But if you ask the overton, Should you marry girl A or girl B? that's a matter properly brought before the oracle. ~~Because there is no science or art of marriage counselling as exact as~~

carpentry or other things are. Yes?

R: "...to ask, for instance, Is it better to get...eered to his mind profane." S: No, even worse. R: Elesphenous. S: Almost blasphemous. Yes? R: "lu short, what the gods have granted us...that is in their grace, tha gods grant a sign."

S: So. Now that is a perfectly orthodox view it seems, and so he has proven that Socrates believed in the gods of the city as everyone would. And than be makes a very strange transition, in the next sentence.

R: "Moreover, Socrates lived ever in the open;..." S: But...He was always in the open. Why is it necessary to add this remark? Well maybe he led a double life. And that is what he did in the open. He consulted the oracle or his own oracle, but he had a private life in which funny or fishy things happened. And therefore Xenophon in his wisdom says he was always in the open. And then of course one has to consider whether that can be literally true. After all he must have some time for sleeping, and for other things--there has to be private...he needs privacy, and so on. Yes? Go ahead.

R: "...for early in the morning he went to the public...and anyone might listen." S: Now again here. "And he spoke most of the time." That is also important. He could always be in public and always be silent. Then you wouldn't be any wiser about what he thought. But to be always in the public and talk always, then nothing can be hidden about the man. The defects of this argument are obvious, I think. Not only because Xenophon says he was talking most of the time--after all, sometimes, at least when he listened to what others said, he was silent. But the difficulty remains of course, the many hours in which he was in private. Yes?

R: "Yet none ever knew him to offend against piety...so favoured by other talkers, 'the Nature of the Universe'..." S: No. "What most others talked," not only talkers, but most other men--meaning that's a funny thing. Namely? R: "...as most of the others did: and he did not speculate...Furthermore..." S: Now let us stop here. So in other words now comes...he begins with a serious proof that Socrates was a very pious man because he never conversed about the nature of all things, about which most people--that is a not quite good translation here. Most people. Everyone talks, most people talk about the nature of things. Only Socrates avoids this dangerous hot iron completely. Yes. And then he goes on to show that Socrates felt that the study of nature is something intrinsically foolish and therefore he cannot be accused of having been impious by studying the nature of things. We have to stop here, and we will continue at this point next time.

I would like to discuss a bit more Xenophon's contribution to our question. I spoke of his fate since roughly 1800, and which leads us to the question, What is the peculiarity of Xenophon, that while he was regarded as a classic, like the other classics of his age, he alone has ceased to occupy that exalted position. Whereas Plato, Thucydides, Sophocles, Aristophanes, and so on have not been degraded this way. Now I tried to explain to you his peculiarity by beginning with a remark occurring at the end of the fifth book of his *Anabasis*, in which he states that one should be as silent as possible about evil as distinguished from the good things, that it would be both more just, more pious...both just and pious and noble and more pleasant to remember the good things rather than the bad ones. One must enlarge that. What is characteristic or peculiar to Xenophon is the greatest possible silence on the greatest things also. And I gave you some examples from the *Memorabilia*, his allusion to the fact that there was a man called Plato without ever saying anything more about that, and his refusal to present a dialogue between Socrates and a man of good nature as distinguished from men of inferior natures. So in other words what Xenophon is...has such a bad press today is the fact that he is so pedestrian, compared with all the other classics. But I tried to show that he is pedestrian...his pedestrianism is only apparent.

Now there is another...And in order to make clear what...I used for a moment the reference to Jane Austen to make clear the peculiar charm and the peculiar limitations of Xenophon. Yet there is another fact which equally reveals Xenophon's peculiarity, and that is something very different from Jane Austen. This very wicked man called Machiavelli quotes Xenophon more frequently than Plato and Aristotle and Cicero combined. This obvious fact—I mean you can easily establish it by means of an index if you don't wish to check the index which sometimes is better. So as I say, Machiavelli does this. How come? Now he refers to two Xenophonic writings, *The Education of Cyrus* and the *Hiero*. *The Education of Cyrus* is the presentation of what Xenophon regarded as the greatest empire builder of whom he had ever heard, the founder of the Persian empire. The *Hiero* is a dialogue on tyranny, how to become a tyrant and how to rule tyrannically after you have occupied this exalted position. Now the *Hiero* is especially interesting and revealing in this respect, more obvious, at least. The *Hiero* is a dialogue between a wise man, the poet Simonides, and the tyrant Hiero of Syracuse. And the poet comes to Syracuse and asks Hiero how it feels to be a tyrant. And Hiero explains to him in winged words that nothing is more terrible than to be a tyrant and that the wisest thing a tyrant could possibly do is to hang himself. So it is in other words a desperate situation. But Hiero, of course, does not hang himself, and this is partly due to the fact that Simonides shows him an alternative how you could live very happily, precisely because you are a tyrant. And then he develops the possibility which are open to a tyrant and nobody else. What is ordinarily overlooked is this, that in this final statement of the poet Simonides it is taken for granted that this man then living entirely for the well being of his subjects came to power in a wholly illegal manner, having killed and robbed thousands of his subjects, and having become guilty of all kinds of the severest punishments on the part of gods and men, yet after he has done all these things, if he is prudent then he can live perfectly happy. So that is a very Machiavellian proposal, although it is not visible because Xenophon always uses this Jane Austenian style; we don't see the wicked things. So he plays with an extreme unsavory possibility more than Plato does; and that's the reason why Machiavelli used him. I will give

you another example from Xenophon's Economicus. Do you have it here? R: Yes. S: In chapter 20, paragraph 21, ff. That is a dialogue on farming. Farming is presented here as the only occupation worthy of a true gentleman. That is a story not only in Xenophon, of course, a very common view--the farmer is not dependent, or does not exploit human beings. He exploits, if one can use that word, the soil but not human beings, and also he is not dependent on human beings in the way in which other men are. Good. Now let us read...And the alternatives, like crafts and trade, and so on, are morally inferior. That's the basis of the whole thing. Now let us continue in paragraph 21.

R: "These, then, are the evils that crush estates...not much pleasure to be got from the land: landed estates and livestock..." S: Yes. R: "...must be continually coming on...and teach it to someone else, if you like." [Loeb ed., 518-519]

S: Socrates is a teacher of that. Yes?

R: "Moreover, my father did not get his knowledge of it...Now on hearing this I asked..." S: "I" being Socrates. R: "Did your father keep all the farms..." You're joking, Socrates, "... [Laughter] S: Yes? R: "...rejoined Ischomachus:...whatever they believe to be benefitted by." [In the Loeb, "whatever they think will bring thus profit."]

S: Thank you. "That all men naturally believe to love whatever they believe will profit them." You see the complicated subjective element entering into what people ordinarily call love. They must believe that they will be benefitted and that will make them love--but they believe to love that. That is of course a very questionable love if it is linked up with a calculation of benefit. Now the point here is this, that at the end of the Economicus here another extreme possibility not seriously considered by a perfect gentleman, namely combination of agriculture with trade. He makes a maximum concession to the agricultural ideal by saying he must do farming, you know, he must do farming. But the farms are used as objects of trade, after having been properly treated. That is fundamentally the same as the deal regarding tyranny in the Hiero. Yes. Now I think we...We began last time to read the first chapter of the Memorabilia, Xenophon's defense of Socrates against the charge. Perhaps we'll finish this section now and turn then to a more general discussion again. Now we had begun to read up to paragraph 10. Now the point up to this was now...What was the question? That Socrates, of course, always sacrificed publicly to the gods of the city and that he also believed in divination, for his divination, with the help of his daimonion, is not fundamentally different from divination by means of birds' flights, and other things. That was the point. And now beginning at paragraph 10.

R: [Loeb ed., 7] "Moreover, Socrates lived ever in the open;..." S: And hence there could not have been a Jekyll and Hyde situation, you know, that he would lead two different lives at the same time. R: He was right out in the open. S: Pardon? R: Right out in the open. S: Yes. [Laughter] R: "...for early in the morning he went to the public promenade...and anyone might listen."

S: So in other words there was no privacy whatever. Only of course that was true during the day, but in the night of course he slept, that's simple answer, yes. Yes?

R: "Yet none ever knew him to offend against piety...so favored by most talkers, 'the Nature of the Universe'..." S: Now that is quite interesting: "by most," he says. And that most people are concerned with the nature of the universe, that doesn't make much sense. But he must have implied most people suspected, in the way in which Socrates was suspected.

R: "...and avoided speculation on the so-called 'Cosmos' of the sophists..." S: Literally, "how what the sophists call 'Cosmos.'" R: "...how it works, and on the laws that govern...others worship stocks and stones and beasts..."

S: These are examples of ordinary insanity, these kinds of extremism. Yes? And now we find also...Now he gives an example of madness or insanity in physiology. Yes?

R: "...so it is, he held, with those who worry with 'Universal Nature.'" S: Yes, "those who worry about..." Yes, "worry" is a literal translation. Who have nothing else to worry but something which is in no way subject to their worrying, to any human worry. Yes?

R: "Some hold that What is is one, others...ever be born or ever die."

S: You see these are also the extreme views which are mad views. And as such, by their being extremes, they point to a view in the middle. That is of course not spelled out by Xenophon, but it is implied. Now what is that middle view? Yes?

R: Well literally that there are a few things which... S: Not a few, but a finite...there are a finite number of beings. Yes? R: Which move sometimes. S: No, no; some being...do not change and others change. Yes? And there are beings which come into being and perish and others which do not come into being and perish. That is the point, that is the implication, that is a description of what the Socratic view of the cosmos is, and that is confirmed by Plato as well as Aristotle, although Aristotle doesn't ascribe it to Socrates, but it's fundamentally the same view. Underlying, for instance, the Platonic doctrine of Ideas: there are not infinitely many Ideas but a finite number. And there are some beings which are changed, changing, coming into being and perishing, and others which don't, namely, the Ideas. So this is...Socrates' cosmology is a conscious return from the madness of his predecessors to the...to sanity. And that means that this view which is here sketched within these few lines is the view which common sense has of the whole and which is only not properly spelled out by common sense. Yes?

R: "Nor were these the only questions he asked about such theorists. Students of human nature..." No, "of human things." That is a crime. The study of human things is not the study of human nature. For example, wealth and poverty are human things; by studying them you do not study directly, at least, human nature. Yes? R: "Students of the human things, he said,...who pry into heavenly phenomena imagine that..." S: Literally, "the divine." R: "...the divine things imagine that,...knowing the causes of these various things?"

S: That is one of the very few references in classical literature to the problem of what we now call technology, of the exploitation of the knowledge of nature for human purposes. And it is here rejected, of course, as something quite

absurd. One doesn't study winds and rains and seasons in order to make them. It is understood one cannot possibly make them--beyond human power. Yes?

R: Isn't there a middle ground? That is, you could study winds to know to get out of their way.

S: Yes. This is...Surely. That would have been admitted. Think only of navigation. Yes?

R: "Such, then, was his criticism of those who meddle...should involve the reproach of 'slavishness.'"

S: In other words, Socrates' piety is here proved by the fact that he did not pry into the divine things and limits himself entirely to the study of human things. But this study of human things has a peculiarity--it always takes on the form of the question, "What is?", as you see from the questions here indicated. And this "What is?" question, which occurs in all Platonic dialogues, and which implies the so-called doctrine of Ideas to which he alludes in a way by the criticism in paragraph 14. This is the peculiarity of the Socratic philosophy. So that we get this directly from Xenophon if we read him with a little bit of care. Yes?

R: "So, in pronouncing..." S: So Xenophon has now proved to everyone's satisfaction that Socrates was pious, because, among other things, he was not a student of nature. Now let us first finish, if you don't mind. Yes?

R: "So, in pronouncing on opinions...matters of common knowledge?"

S: Literally, "things which everyone...which all knew."

R: "...things which all knew? For instance,...that Socrates was a free-thinker,..."

S: No, "that Socrates was not sober," or "sound regarding the gods." Yes?

R: "...uneound on the gods, when he never said...believed the charge brought against Socrates..." S: And so on. Now let us stop here. Now he goes over to the second part of the charge, the corruption charge. As for the corruption charge, according to Xenophon, there were only a few who believed that he corrupted the young. What about the impiety charge discussed hitherto? Beginning of paragraph 20.

R: "The Athenians." S: In other words this was the general opinion, that he was guilty, that he was guilty of impiety but not of corruption, of corrupting the young. And now he devoted about four pages to the refutation of the graver charge, which was much more plausible; and he devotes, say, about 20 pages to the lesser charge of the truth of which very few Athenians were convinced. That is very strange. Now furthermore, when you look at the discussion of the impiety charge, the first part of the charge, Xenophon presents the situation--Everyone knew that Socrates was a pious man; one could see him bringing sacrifices on the public altars every day; he had no private life of his own. His soul was as clear and visible to everyone, like that of a dog. When you look at his eyes you see all his [thoughts?] which crossed his mind. The same would be true of Socrates. But then

at the end, in paragraph 17 ff., he says there was only a single fact which was universally or generally known regarding Socrates' piety, and that was that he had kept that oath in the trial of the generals. Now that Socrates opposed a vicious and illegal action does not of course prove that he believed in the gods which the city believed. So in other words Aeschylus, while refuting the first part of the charge, shows us at the same time the weakness of his own refutation.

And then there is another point toward the end. He makes...¹⁴when he makes Socrates speak about the gods knowing everything. The things spoken, the things done, and the things silently deliberated. He later on, in the last paragraph, as you see, speaks only of what Socrates said and did, and of course not of the silent deliberations, i.e., the thoughts; and this question of what Socrates thought about the gods remains therefore entirely open. Yes. Now we may make here a stop before we turn to a few passages of the second chapter, i.e., of the discussion of the second part of the charge. Mr. Shulsky, you were one of those who wanted...

Shulsky: What would be the status of Socrates' investigation of human things if one of the question he asks is, What is piety? Doesn't that lead him to prying into divine things as well?

S: Yes. I'm afraid so. So the line cannot so easily be drawn. If someone says he will simply study only moral and political subjects and be entirely indifferent to the natural things. You can state it also in a different way--it's fundamentally the same thing--as in the Republic. You want to find out what justice is. Then you have to know something about the soul; and the soul is from the Greek point of view, of course, something which is by nature eternal...even more by nature, one could say, than stones and other things. Yes?

Schaeffer: Would you explain something about the fact that he says on page 5 here that it would be mad to consult the gods about something about which human beings are able to... , whereas a few paragraphs later he says that the gods give signs to men about all human affairs? S: You mean in what we read last time. Schaeffer: No, what we just read now. S: Why don't you tell me the paragraph. Schaeffer: Paragraph 9 he says, "They're mad if they consult oracles on questions about which the gods..." S: Yes, that is true. In other words, in the first step of the argument it is said there is a certain sphere where men can know--the arts, the ordinary arts. And yet there is connected with that the kind of questions which go beyond human knowledge, the answers to which go beyond human knowledge, namely, the event, the result. You plant trees according to the rules of the art of tree planting. That doesn't guarantee success. And therefore that depends on tyche whether you are successful...on chance, whether it's successful or not. And here only omniscient beings can give you advice, and therefore you have recourse to divination. Schaeffer: But my point is that in the first case there he says that there are certain things about which it would be mad to consult the gods. S: Sure, if you want to find out...If you try to solve an arithmetical problem and would go to the oracle in Delphi, that would be mad. Schaeffer: Then in paragraph 19 he says that the gods give signs to men about all human affairs, implying that... S: But the question...All right. But to what extent...In paragraph 19.

R: "...that they are present everywhere, and grant signs to men of all that concerns man."

S: Paragraph 19? R: 19 end. S: Yes. Well of course that would not apply to arithmetic. But farming would come under that heading in a way, because it is a human concern.

Schaeffer: In other words if the gods give signs to men about the human concerns...

S: Yes, yes. That would be another difficulty. That properly elaborated would be another difficulty. Schaeffer: [Would you elaborate it?] S: Well, what are...In other words there is the sphere of divine knowledge and there is the sphere of human knowledge. That seems to be very...it's a clear line. Say, the outcome, the results, of human actions are not knowable, because chance intervenes. And therefore you have recourse to oracles. But then on reflection there are some difficulties. To some extent one can predict. For example, if someone wastes his inheritance and is always to be found in the company of gamblers and similar on-
 away people, you reasonably predict a bad end. Now it might happen that when everything falls down, some uncle dies who leaves him another inheritance which saves him, and which you could not...perhaps you could not have known. So these predictions have always the character, if nothing wholly unexpected happens. But prediction within limits is possible, of course. So it is not so easy to draw the line between what men can foresee and what they cannot foresee.

Schaeffer: Why does Socrates call it blasphemous to consult the gods about things which human beings can decide if he also says that the gods give signs to men about all human affairs? I mean that implies that the gods [make the information?] available...

S: But it is possible to say that the human things of which he speaks at the end of paragraph 19 are the things not subject to technai, to arts. And to the extent to which they are subject to technai it would be an insult to the gods to ask them, say, to test their knowledge of arithmetic or geometry; that would be surely an impious act. Yes, oh yes--I'm sorry.

Fielding: Socrates at the end of paragraph 15 also seems to cast aspersions upon knowledge which is knowledge only, but then goes on...or Xenophon goes on to say that he is concerned with the question, What is? It would seem that there might be a relation between...

S: Well this is a very...There are other , especially in Menon 81b, Book IV, chapter 7, where he discusses to what extent, according to Socrates, one should study arithmetic and other...and astronomy, and so on. Now the view here suggested is this: Don't worry about things which are none of your business, especially since the gods don't like it if you try to find out their secrets by studying them. That's clear. But concentrate on what is your business as a human being, i.e., on the human things. That is simple and has been said by all kinds of people. And now but there is only one slight difference between this very frequently said thing and what Socrates says. Namely, Socrates' concern with the human things is a concern with what they are; to use a much mis-used later expression, with the essence of the various human things. And this changes the picture completely. Because by raising this What is? question, you are compelled to restore in a new manner and on a new basis the doctrine of nature. If you ask, Who is that? Say, who knocks at the door, or so. That does not meet beyond ordinary human preoccupation. It's freely a matter of its essence. Is it

you raise the question, What is man?, a question which is not stated here in this form but only implied, then you cannot possibly say, What is man? without distinguishing him from non-man. And you have to know non-man in order to know man, and so on. So in other words, the whole position of Socrates which is sketched here leads to the consequence, which is much more directly visible in Plato, that the Socratic return to sanity leads to a physiologia of a new kind, prepared in various ways by some earlier thinkers but still the fundamental difference and radical difference remains.

Fielding: But is not that direction or that re-direction in the direction of knowing rather than...

S: But this kind of...Well, the concern with human things in the sense as a concern with the essential character of the human things, is at first glance humanly relevant, whereas the concern with the heavenly bodies or with what is beneath the earth is at first glance not humanly relevant. Is this not...does it not make sense? Because these questions, as it's stated here--what is just, what is unjust, and so on, are important for man's conduct of his life, so that this knowledge is manifestly relevant for action, whereas the knowledge of heavens, at first glance, has no relevance for human action. It's not our business.

Fielding: But the presentation is ambiguous. I mean it might be suggested that those things which man can know, that is, human knowledge, not precisely concerning human things; but one does not necessarily study human things because he wishes to make men better but because perhaps he wishes to have knowledge.

S: Yes, but if you think for one moment you see that this doesn't work. For example, to know what human excellence is cannot but affect your own life, your own judgment of yourself. Even if you say you begin the study of then only with a theoretical interest. I mean can you reach some judgement on what you should do without being compelled that...feeling that you ought to do it, you ought to do it? Is this possible?

Fielding: Well, perhaps there's another way of putting it. One might regard the theoretical search as that which one should do.

S: That is another...Sure, ultimately that coincides. But since you took it from his side...It is impossible to make a study of man's excellences without some practical consequence flowing from that study. And to that extent it is relevant for life, for action, what you study apparently in a purely theoretical intent. The opposite is of course also true, that if you are guided only by the practical concern with becoming a gentleman, you have to know what a gentleman is; you have to engage in that theoretical pursuit of what is a gentleman in order to guide your action and to conduct your life properly. And that is the basis for this distinction. There are objects which are not immediately relevant for man's goodness and objects which are. And Xenophon presents Socrates as being concerned only with the human things because this is surely necessary for man, and even the gods cannot, however much they might wish to keep man down, even the gods cannot deny that man acts within his proper sphere by trying to find out about the human things. I don't see the difficulty which you have.

Fielding: Well it does seem that the endeavor is still at least of two-fold

character, and that one may be emphasized at the expense of the other.

S: No, I think ... the objection which was made before is, can this line be drawn in this way, even granting that there is a primary necessity for the study of human things, as distinguished from other things? Are you not necessarily drawn into the study of all things if you try to understand the human things? That is the question; that alone. But that there is a primary reasonableness to the demand that the proper study of mankind is man and not serpents or worms, or even horses and dogs, that makes always sense. But the question is, must you not, in a certain manner, know serpents and dogs and horses in order to know man? That is the same problem as indicated here.

Fielding: But Aristotle will later distinguish theoretical and moral virtues.

S: But still would he deny that...Aristotle makes the distinction on this basis: That you have to know of the soul in order to understand the moral virtues in the way in which the morally virtuous man has to know them, you don't have to have a very precise knowledge of the soul and a very rough knowledge, which he sketches, would be perfectly sufficient. But is it not necessary, then, also to raise the question, What about the place of moral virtue as Aristotle understands that, in the economy of human life? And then you have to go beyond the horizon of the morally virtuous man to that of the wise man [to come again?]. That within certain limits these distinctions are tenable, and especially in the form in which Aristotle made them, I would be the last to deny. But are they ultimately tenable? And especially for Aristotle? That would be the question. For example, at the end of the Ethics, when he discusses the relation of the morally virtuous man to the wise man. And then the question ultimately arises, to what extent--a question which Aristotle does not explicitly raise but which is implied in what he says--to what extent is moral virtue an ingredient of theoretical wisdom? Then you are already in deep waters. And Aristotle, who also had something in common with Jane Austen, does not go into this question, although if you read him with normal care you are confronted with this question. Good. Now let us turn to what Xenophon does regarding the second part of the charge, the corruption charge. Now we cannot possibly read this very long statement, but let us look only at a few passages. Chapter II, paragraph 9, beginning.

R: Page 15, bottom. "But, said his accuser, he taught..." S: "But by Zeus,..." R: "But by Zeus, said his accuser,...to despise the established regime and made them violent." S: And so on and so on. So you see here he begins now to quote the accuser. There is no a consensus of scholars to the effect that this is not the true, historical accuser but some sophist, Polycrates, who wrote a pamphlet just for the fun of it many years after Socrates' death, and Xenophon replied to that. Well, we don't know that. We don't know that. And it is utterly uninteresting. The interesting point is that Xenophon here, in replying to the second part of the charge, quotes the accuser, whereas in replying to the first part of the charge, the gravest part of the charge, he never quotes the accuser. Now therefore we do not know which evidence, if any, the accusers used in order to prove that Socrates was impious, whereas we get some inkling of what the accusers said regarding Socrates' corrupting the young. Now let us read the next point made by the accuser, in paragraph 12. You see here of course that this is...Xenophon does not refute this. Socrates criticized the established constitution, the established political order, by questioning the wisdom of choosing

officials by lot. And this is of course goes then to the root of the Athenian regime, and this must always be considered if we try to understand the fate of Socrates. Now go on, paragraph 12 and 13.

R: "But, said his accuser. Among the associates of Socrates...the wrong these two men wrought the city..." S: literally, "If...I will not apologise if these two men did anything wrong to the polis." He doesn't even grant that, Xenophon. Yes?

R: "...but I will explain how they came to be with Socrates. Ambition..."

S: Yes, and so on. And then he gives a plausible account of why they were attracted by Socrates and why Socrates was repelled by them. But let us read later on in the same chapter, paragraph 38, when he comes to speak of the two men again in detail. "Of what manner the being together of Critias to Socrates was and how they behaved toward each other has been said." Yes? "I would say..."

R: "I venture to lay it down," page 31, "that learners get nothing...can you teach me what a law is?"

S: You see, that's one of these famous Socratic questions. What is a law? And not meaning this or that law regarding drunken driving, or whatever it may be, but law as law, this famous universal, or abstract, question.

R: "'Certainly,' he replied." S: Pericles. Pericles, I mean a man of...the stature of which I suppose you all have a notion. Yes? R: "Then pray teach me." S: "By the gods." R: Ah. "By the gods teach me....who does not know what a law is."

S: Is it not an important point? How can he know that he is law-abiding if he does not know that he abides by laws? And how can he know that if he does not know what a law is? A good point, if very impractical. Yes. [laughter]

R: "'Well, Alcibiades, there is no great difficulty...are we to call that force or not?'" [para. 45] S: Let us say, "violence, or not." R: "Every-thing, I think, that men...enacts without persuasion is not law, but violence!"

S: So in other words the democracy is fundamentally tyranny. And how does Pericles retort to that?

R: "'Alcibiades,' said Pericles,...at your clever-est in these things!" [laughter]

S: Now this...First of all the whole question...This brief one page on this great subject what is law is of course interesting enough in itself, especially if you consider the fact that there is no dialogue of Plato, with the exception of the *Minos* now generally regarded as spurious, which is devoted to the question, What is Law? Now here in Xenophon of course not Socrates raises this dynastic-like question, What is law?, but the naughty Alcibiades. But it so happened that the naughty Alcibiades was connected with Socrates at the time when he raised the Socratic question, What is law? So here Xenophon says while denying it to what extent Socrates was responsible for the corruption of Alcibiades. Because this argument here to which Pericles--the representative of democratic Athens--had no reply.

Therefore he had to dig deeper or to choose whatever he liked, because this was not greatly inferior theoretically at any rate to what Pericles suggested. I mention in passing, since we have read the Crito, that the question, What is law?, is of course never raised in the Crito, which made things much easier for Socrates in replying to Crito. Now let us look at another passage in Chapter II, paragraph 49-50. There are many more things; I wish we had the time to read the whole second chapter. Let us read paragraph 49-50.

R: "But," said his accuser,...to keep the more ignorant in gaol." S: No, "fettering" him. That is of course a reference to Zeus' fettering of Kronos. Yes? R: "In reality Socrates held that,...deserves to learn from those who know it." S: Now apply this to the father-son relation. Then you get the situation if you have the wise son and the ignorant father, is the wise son not under an obligation to listen...the unwise father not under an obligation to listen to his wise son? The question comically presented by Aristophanes in the relation between Strepsiades and Phidippides in The Clouds. Well there are many more things. We simply do not have the time.

I would like to return to a more general question regarding Xenophon now. And that is in the first place, what is the meaning of this work, the Memorabilia? As a whole. The title can be translated by Recollections, not "Recollections of Socrates," as it is frequently said, because there is nothing of Socrates in the title. Recollections. Xenophon's recollections par excellence are his recollections of Socrates, and not his recollections of his own great deeds in Asia Minor when he saved the Greeks and brought them back to Greece. That he calls The Way Up, Anabasis. And only the recollections of Socrates are the recollections of Xenophon. Now let us see...look at the beginning of Chapter III of the first book. Because the first two chapters are devoted to the refutation of the charge and then a new subject begins. Yes?

R: "In order to support my opinion...I will set down what I recollect of these." S: "Whatever I may recollect." So...and this is the kind of title, superscription of all what follows. Socrates as a benefactor of his companions. But what is that word, the Xenophontic expression, for such benefaction? Let us turn to the very end of the Memorabilia. Paragraph 11, the last paragraph.

R: Bottom 357. "This was the tenor of his conversation..." S: The next part. R: "All who knew what manner of man Socrates was...as the chief of helpers in the quest of virtue." S: Literally, "as the most useful with a view to the concern with virtue." Yes? R: "For myself, I have described him...then let him judge."

S: What Xenophon says here at the end is, Look at the other characters which I, Xenophon, have described elsewhere--Cyrus, and whoever they were--and compare that with Socrates and then you will see that my judgement is correct. But we read this passage for another reason, namely, what is the name for the virtue through which a man is most helpful, most beneficial, to others? To men he comes in contact with?

A: Benevolence?

S: No, no, no.

A: [inaudible] S: Pardon? A: [inaudible] S: No, no.

R: "...so just that he did no injury,...but conferred the greatest benefits," namely, justice."

S: Justice, justice. Now, so the theme of the Memorabilia is Socrates' justice. Except for the two first chapters, which refute the charge. But what does it mean to refute the charge? What is the formula of the charge? How does it begin? R: Socrates is an unjust man. S: Commits acts of injustice. So in other words, by refuting it you show also that Socrates was just, if in a narrower sense. So we can say that the Memorabilia as a whole are devoted to presenting the justice of Socrates. But Xenophon wrote three other Socratic writings--the Economicus, the Banquet, and the Apology of Socrates. Now what...In order to see how they are related we only have to look at the beginnings of these three works. Read the beginning of the Economicus.

R: "I once heard him discuss the subject of estate management in the following manner."

S: "Discussing," literally, "having a conversation." Dialogomai, speaking. Look at the beginning of the Apology first.

R: "I have always considered the manner in which Socrates behaved after he had been summoned to his trial as most worthy of our remembrance, and that not only with respect to the defence he made for himself..."

S: No, that is...He misses the decisive point. "It seems to me worthy to remember regarding Socrates also how when he was called...when he was accused he deliberated about the defence and the end of his life." So here deliberation, in the case of the Economicus--speaking. Now what about the Banquet, beginning?

R: I don't have the Banquet. S: Oh, I see. Do you have it? R: "I am of opinion that as well the sayings as the actions of great men deserve to be recorded, whether they treat of serious subjects with the greatest application of mind, or giving themselves some respite..."

S: No, where does he get "the sayings"? "It seems to me that not only the... that the actions of gentlemen, not only those which are done with seriousness, are worthy of being remembered, but also of those done in a jocular or playful manner." So here we have the jocular deeds of gentlemen, and Socrates was one of these. So, Socrates' jocular deed: more generally, Socrates' deed. That this deed of Socrates is only jocular is interesting, and has all kinds of consequences. Now when you look at a passage which we read before, in Memorabilia Book I, Chapter I, paragraph 19, you see that Xenophon makes here, as he does elsewhere, the following distinction: the things said, the things done, and the things deliberated, silently deliberated. You have the plan of his Socratic writings. The Economicus being the Socratic conversation, the Socratic logos written by Xenophon; the Symposium containing the deed of Socrates, what he did on the occasion of this banquet and in a jocular manner; and finally the Apology, Socrates' silent deliberation about the defence to be made, and about the end of his life, in the Apology. Yes.

There is another point which one might mention regarding the other Socratic

writings, the three ones. Well, in order to see, however, the Socratic writings properly, one must overlook all the writings of Xenophon. And then one will see that they have two foci. [blackboard] The one is of course Socrates, and that means primarily the four Socratic writings of which I spoke. The other is Cyrus, founder of the Persian empire, the subject of the largest work of Xenophon, the Education of Cyrus. But Xenophon in his quaint way occasionally identifies this

Cyrus with the Cyrus of his time who tried to depose the then Persian king, Artaxerxes. He identifies somewhere in the Economicus the two Cyruses, so that Xenophon's Anabasis, which describes the ascent from the western coast of Asia Minor towards the interior and the way back, which was much more difficult, under the guidance or leadership of Xenophon, that is also...deals also with Cyrus, if another Cyrus, Persian empire. And there are some other writings which are somehow in between these two foci, like the Greek History, Hellenica, and the smaller writings on dogs and horses, and the Constitution of Athens--or Constitution of Sparta. I must not say the Constitution of Athens because that is now one of the sacred things that you must not say that this is a writing of Xenophon's. This was written by an individual called the Old Oligarch. You may have heard this occasionally in my courses. Xenophon could not have written it because that's not Xenophon's style. And this refers to a situation in Athens antedating Xenophon's maturity by some decades or more or less. As if Xenophon could not have written like a somewhat grouchy landed proprietor living at that time, when Xenophon himself was still a young boy. I don't see any intrinsic impossibility in that. But it would of course deprive the book very much of its value for writing a statistically correct history of Athens, you know, if it had any such frivolous implications, and therefore no one considered that possibility. [laughter] Good.

Now, yes. These are the two foci, and one does not understand Xenophon at all if one does not see his Socrates with a view to the Cyrus presented as the greatest representative of the political life. After all, however highly you might think of Pericles, Pericles did not found something like the Persian empire. And you would have to wait for Alexander the Great until you would find a Greek doing that. Therefore it is necessary...and vice versa. Of course you cannot understand Xenophon's Cyrus, the man of the greatest political achievement, unless you measure him by the standard Xenophon erects in his description of Socrates.

Now there is another little point which I might mention, since I have spoken of frivolity. The four Socratic writings -- Memorabilia, Economicus, the Banquet-Symposium--and the Apology. Now this...the Apology takes with the Symposium...Banquet takes place in the house of Callias, a man from a very old, distinguished family, himself a rather ridiculous individual. And the Apology is a conversation between Socrates and Callias' brother, Harmogenes. Callias is known to some of you from the Protagoras, Plato's Protagoras, in whose house the conversation takes place. And now the Economicus is a discussion chiefly with a man called Ischomachus. And now we know this Ischomachus cannot be identified, because the name Ischomachus was quite common, and while there is a reference occasionally to the father's name of Ischomachus--you know the ordinary way to designate an Athenian--the father's name is never given. So we don't know which Ischomachus. But in one of the orators--I believe it is [Andochides?]; I do not remember exactly--we are told a strange story about a certain Ischomachus, and who was the father-in-law of Callias. So that I believe one of the principles keeping these minor Socratic writings together is some reference to this distinguished, if somewhat ridiculous, Athenian house. And the reason why I am in-

clined to believe that is what [Andochides? or Andoppides?] or whoever that orator was says about that particular Ischomachus who was a father-in-law of Callias. When you read the Economicus you will see the first subject taken up there when Socrates presents himself as a teacher of the economic art--economic art means of course not merely the art of getting money; it means the art of managing the household, and the slaves, children, and the wife. Now the first subject taken up is how to train the wife, what I call the gynecologia [laughter]; that is the first part of the Economicus. And there Ischomachus describes how he trained her so that she was a model of a wife. And that is very charming and very amusing to read. And now the Ischomachus of whom we know from that orator had a wife and then a daughter from this marriage, and that daughter married Callias. And Callias, who was a playboy of the worst kind, had then illicit relations with his mother-in-law, while of course his wife was still living...living--that was part of the gossip of Athens. Now the funny thing would be if Ischomachus, when he tells the story of that wonderful way in which he educated his young wife here, would later on have this great disappointment. [laughter] And I regard it as perfectly possible that this is implied in Xenophon's treatment of this matter. I thought this is not wholly inappropriate to mention that.

Now the Economicus is one of the most detailed presentation of the whole question of the management of the household which we have, apart from Aristotle's writings on the subject. And...comes some indication there--the economic art is not fundamentally different from the political art, and that is developed there at some greater length, and not without some amusing ; some of them you saw from the passage read to you earlier in this class.

Now I think I would like to mention only two more passages from Xenophon--one from the Banquet, because it is quite characteristic, and I believe it has not found the attention which it deserves. It is in Chapter IV, paragraph 56. There is on the occasion of a banquet, i.e., where people were in a slightly intoxicated condition, where many things were possible which would not be permitted without this occasion. And each one has to say what he regards as the best thing he possesses. And Socrates of course also has something good which he...Do you have it? IV, 56?

R: There are no numbers in... S: Now let me see whether I find it. It is after that here. Now let me...I believe it is about here. Let me see. Where he says...Where Callias says to Socrates, "What is it of which you are proud?" And Socrates claims to be proud of having the art of...not the midwife; what do you call that? Who brings together. A: Match-maker. S: Pardon? Match-maker. "But why are you so proud on such an undistinguished art?" Yes?

R: "'For really I take it to be a scandalous one....they made him no other answer than 'Doubtless.'"

S: In Greek, panomenon. Socrates asks something and all say, "Certainly." Plato has frequently been ridiculed for the fact that the repliers always say--but they do not always say the same--but more or less, Undoubtedly, Surely, Necessarily, and so on. And they say how unartistic this is. Yes?

R: "'Certainly,' answered all the company....that the business of an artist of that kind..."

S: A matchmaker, let us...Why does he try to avoid that word?

R: The 19th century had its drawbacks. S: Yes. [laughter]

R: "...so as that the persons they introduce be perfectly agreeable...others that conciliate love and affection?" "Certainly."

S: Watch that it is always the same answer, "Certainly," or however you translate; panmemonoun. Yes?

R: "If than the midwife... ch....the matchmaker... [laughter] be in his profession, ought he not to instruct those that are under his direction which way to make themselves agreeable to others in all these things mentioned?...Some of them answered him as before, with 'Certainly.'"

S: There they split; there they split. "And some said, 'Of course he who makes them agreeable to most people.' And the others said, 'Certainly.'" And now what does Socrates say?

R: "And the rest said it was very plain...and deserves he not to receive a handsome reward?"

S: Let me stop here. Where is that point? This is so verbose, one does not really recognize it. Fielding: The end of paragraph 60. S: No, there...In paragraph 59. "Then there was a split. Some said...gave an answer and said, 'He who makes the candidate agreeable to most,' and the others evaded the question by simply saying... answer to such a question, 'Certainly.'" As if you say, "Would you like to have mutton or veal?" You would say, "Certainly." And they said...But Socrates said that this is also...There is also agreement as to that. I.e., Socrates claims that there is still universal agreement while there is no longer universal agreement. This is a part of the art of Socrates, to consider dissent under certain conditions and to disregard dissent under other conditions. The translation is very bad at this point.

Now if we had more time, of course we would consider more passages in Xenophon. One of the most interesting and obviously relevant is the discussion of justice in the first book of the Education of Cyrus. There Cyrus is presented as a wonderful boy, of course, and especially in Daykin's translation as the finest type of British public schoolboy. And then he is brought up in Persia, which is a super-Sparta--very virtuous and very noble. But unfortunately his mother comes from Medes, and Medes is ruled by a tyrant. And so he is...while visiting with his grandfather, he becomes aware of the [essentials] of tyrannical life and this is the origin of his corruption. And when he comes home from this stay with the maternal grandfather, he has a conversation with his mother about justice, in which the key question is, Does justice consist in giving or leaving to everything what belongs to it, or in giving or leaving to him what is good for him? And the simple example here--the unforgettable example, in its simplicity--is the big boy with a small coat and the small boy with a big coat. Would it not be juster if you would give the big coat to the big boy and the small coat to the small boy? That is what young Cyrus, the future tyrannical ruler, suggests that, in his plain common sense. But he was severely beaten by the teacher because he was not asked what is good for that boy, but what belongs to him, what is just. And here you see the great question. If what is just is not the same what is good, some buildings begin to tumble. And then...So this is...Then later on, when Cyrus has

reached manhood, and is then out as general, by the Persian , he has another conversation on justice, this time with his father. And here the great question is this: He had been brought up in the simple verities--Thou shalt not lie, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not rob, etc., etc. And now he is told by his father, Thou shalt lie, Thou shalt cheat, Thou shalt kill, namely, in war. And then the father explains to him in this charming Xenophonic way, and he tells him, "Well, we told you these unqualified prohibitions when you were children, just as we told you the story of the stork when you were children. But now when you are grown up you are old enough to make distinctions, and say, well this first was true regarding fellow citizens in peace-time--there you must not steal, lie, and so on and so on. But in war against foreign communities, there what was good in the relations among citizens is bad." That's another grave aspect of the problem of justice. One could not state the problems of justice more simply and tellingly as Xenophon does in these two chapters. And I think among the many things you might wisely do during the Christmas vacation, this should occupy a privileged place, to read these two chapters.

Now this is all I have to say. And we will meet again on Thursday here at 3:30. And you don't bring with you any books or notebooks except the ones empty which you will use for your examination. Yes.